

# BACONIANA

Founded 1886.

June 1956

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial - - - - -	1
Obituary - - - - -	7
Van den Weaff's Portrait of Elizabeth - - - - -	8
A Century of Books - - - - -	11
The Name Shake-speare- - - - -	19
Towards a more correct Biography of Francis Bacon -	30
Some Notes on "Baconiana": III - - - - -	33
Tenison's Baconiana, 1679 - - - - -	34
Francis Bacon as Essayist and Orator - - - - -	38
The Secret Service in Tudor Times - - - - -	46
Correspondence - - - - -	50

Published periodically

LONDON:

Published by THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at  
Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1, and printed by the  
Rydal Press, Keighley.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2025

# BACONTIANA

Founded 1886

November 1956

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial- - - - -	53
Obituary - - - - -	58
A Memoir of Mr. Howard Bridgewater - - - - -	59
Francis Bacon's Life - - - - -	60
A Discourse on the Life of Mr. Francis Bacon, Chancellor of England - - - - -	62
A Pioneer, IV. - - - - -	67
Shakes-peare's Sonnets and "Mr. W.H." - - - - -	75
Towards a more Correct Biography of Francis Bacon- Falstaff's Death - - - - -	85
Did Francis Bacon Die in 1626? - - - - -	91
Correspondence - - - - -	94
	98

Published periodically

LONDON:

Published by THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at  
Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1, and printed by the  
Rydal Press, Keighley.









Portrait of Queen Elizabeth from de Larray's *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et D' Irlande*. Rotterdam, 1707.

# BACONIANA

---

VOL. XL (71st Year)

No. 154

JUNE, 1956

---

*It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.*

---

## EDITORIAL

WE print as our frontispiece an interesting portrait of Queen Elizabeth I, to which Dr. Gerstenberg first drew our attention, kindly sending us a photograph from Trinity College, Dublin. Since then, Professor Henrion has also sent us a photograph of another copy of the picture in Paris. As stated in BACONIANA, No. 153, the picture is taken from de Larray's "*Histoire d'Angleterre, D' Ecosse, et d'Irlande*" (Rotterdam 1707). In this book, as Dr. Gerstenberg points out, there is also some ambiguity about the date of Bacon's death; but let us deal with the portrait first. Who, may we ask, are represented by the conventional and cherubic figures in the light? And do their insignia—the palm-leaf<sup>1</sup> and toga of one, and the helm or rudder and barley of the other—refer to the Queen or to themselves?

More intriguing still, who is the child in the shadow on the Queen's left-hand side? About the same age as the others, he is depicted, apparently in a linen gown, struggling from the shadow towards the light past a sort of sacrificial flame. We have not read de Larray's "*Histoire*", but we feel that the curious juxtaposition of these figures calls for explanation, and like Bacon's *Wisdom of the Ancients*, "almost proclaims a mystery from afar".

It is for readers to draw their own conclusions from the evidence here presented. As in the case of those pregnant title-pages of the early Dutch editions of Bacon, readers may decide for themselves whether the artist had something unusual to impart, or whether he was merely amusing himself with ornamentation. Obviously De Larray's "*Histoire*" and its fine illustrations must be considered in context. We are therefore very pleased to print on page 8 a short and illuminating study of this question by Professor Henrion.

In addition we print from the same work the fine portrait of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (page 8) also kindly sent to us by

---

<sup>1</sup> Not a goose-quill as we surmised in our last issue.



Dr. Gerstenberg. Again the lines of the inscription are interesting, suggesting almost in the same breath, that Leicester was "too proud a favourite "of the Queen", while she, "at the expense of his pride" managed to "vindicate her *suspected* good name". For, as Professor Henrion confirms, "gloire" in those days meant honour; but he regards this inscription as intentionally non-committal, in as much as it does not say that Elizabeth was justly or unjustly suspected by rumour, but merely that she defended her honour by hurting Leicester's pride. There are other carefully drawn and eloquent symbols beneath this portrait. Can any reader please identify the poisonous looking fruit or blossom?

\* \* \* \*

Bacon's idea that men best receive knowledges dressed in "flesh and blood" was certainly put into effect in the play of Richard III.

Indeed nearly all Shake-spere plays may be said to satisfy Bacon's demand for a "new method"—a method whereby philosophy could glide "obliquely" into "minds most obstructed" by way of the "affections"—the entry of truth "*with chalk to mark up its lodgings, instead of with arms to conquer*" which he so often commended.

With so many "stars" to glitter in its dark and lowering sky, the film of Richard III is magnificent entertainment. It is the last film of a great producer the late Sir Alexander Korda, to whose insight and vision the film owes much. Sir Lawrence Olivier's Richard is a masterly achievement. The high pitched rasping voice, in which evil thoughts and glib falsehoods are so wittily spoken, is crystal clear. His hypocrisies are transparent and fool nobody; but his exits and entrances, his stage effects and display—rather like those of Hitler—are almost hypnotic in their effect.

Memorable too, is the scene where Richard, on the throne at last, turns on his friends. His most cutting line "I am not in the giving vein today," has the lash of a whip. The famous opening soliloquy, "Now is the winter of our discontent . . .", is excellently spoken but seemed to us a trifle disjointed through movement and the cutting of well-known lines. The result is that Richard, while still descanting on his own deformity, does not lead up so pointedly to his own special brand of villainy, which is left to unfold itself as the play proceeds. Although this conforms with modern stage-craft, the virtue of the soliloquy is to some extent lost. The same criticism applies to the pruning of certain lines in Clarence's vivid dream.

Like "Macbeth," "Richard III" is a continuous tale of blood and murder, unrelieved by buffoonery or hint of the grotesque. But even Macbeth has a touch of *glamour* and a real affection for his wicked wife, whereas Richard is all *illusion*. His intellectual brilliance is the fascination. He is glass-hard and, like a distorting mirror, false to everything. Not even a wife in child-birth can move him from that "poor centre" which Bacon called "self". The rhythm of the later tragedies, "Lear" and "Othello", is amplified by softer and sweeter moments in which the soul of a Cordelia or a Desdemona, or the intuition of a Kent, can dispel the gloom and recall a more golden



world. But here there is no relief, not even the solid flesh and mirth of a Falstaff to balance the tale of murder and the chorus of bitter curses.

Nevertheless one must confess to becoming strangely infected by the high spirits of Richard—this “bottled spider” whose superior mental energy seems to dominate the play. The “demon” lover has an intimate and unlawful attraction for something within all of us, but this play leaves a bitter taste which even the final glorification of Henry Tudor cannot dispel.

The branding with infamy of the last Plantagenet, and the glorifying of the first Tudor (however necessary to the dramatic purpose),<sup>1</sup> are here carried to lengths which make one suspect hack-writing on the grand scale. Both “Richard III” and “Richard II” were printed anonymously for the first time in 1597. It is therefore not impossible that “Richard III” may have served a dual purpose, as a sop to the Tudor Queen, to abate her sharply expressed anger at the deposition scene in “Richard II”.

The date is important; for in the following year (1598) the name “Shakespeare” suddenly appears in the Second Edition of “Richard II” and the First Edition of “Love’s Labour’s Lost”. Was Elizabeth really taken in by this piece of literary juggling, or was she expected to see through it? The charming account of her talk with Francis Bacon about Hayward’s “Richard II”, implies that she was mollified by his plea that “the author had stolen many of his conceits and phrases from Cornelius Tacitus”. She seems to have given up fencing with him, though we doubt if she was really put off the scent. Perhaps, with apologies to Kipling, we might sum it up as follows:

“She knew ‘e stole, ‘e knew she knowed.  
They didn’t tell, nor make a fuss  
They winked at “Tacitus” down the road,  
And ‘e winked back—the same as us!

It was in the year 1597 that Francis Bacon (at the age of thirty-seven) printed his first book, the *Essays*. It is significant that the famous Northumberland MS. originally included the *Essays* with “Richard II” and “Richard III”, and Bacon’s orations for Gray’s Inn.

As Spedding says, the manuscript would have been in use shortly before 1597 when these two plays and Bacon’s *Essays* were still unprinted. Surely if this document had not mentioned Bacon at all, nor any of his works, but only “Shakespeare”, it would have been hailed as a priceless piece of evidence. As it is, every effort is made to soft pedal it.

As with all exposed manuscripts, the writing is now reported to be fading. Fortunately, however, it was reproduced in facsimile by Spedding in 1870, and Burgoyne in 1904. In our opinion this valuable piece of Baconian evidence ought to be considered whenever the authorship of “Shakespeare” is under discussion, and we marvel at the

---

<sup>1</sup>“I make ‘Tables of Invention’ for Anger, Fear and Shame, as well as for example in Civil Affairs”. (Bacon: *Novum Organum*).

orthodox scholar, who *can* dismiss it so glibly. Marlowe, by the way, is not mentioned in this scribbling, but there is a vague reference to "inferior plays" by Nash.

\* \* \* \*

Printing troubles may restrict "Baconiana" to two issues this year, but the economy will enable us to provide for additional illustrations. Baconian evidence is sometimes better conveyed visually than verbally, leaving the reader free to form his own interpretation. At Trinity College, Cambridge (on the anniversary of Bacon's birthday), the writer found that a display of contemporary books, plus the use of a magic lantern, roused more interest than a plain talk would have done. The subject was pursued till past midnight, thus confirming Bacon's dictum that the "initiative" method is often more convincing than the "magistral."

\* \* \* \*

The precise date of Bacon's death has long been a debatable question in our Society. In December the orthodox account was strongly defended by Mr. Eagle, but many members remain unconvinced. This is a question which has not yet been finally decided, so it is only fair to give space to any concrete evidence bearing on the point. At Dr. Gerstenberg's suggestion we republish the portrait of Bacon taken from the 1627 *Sylva Sylvarum*, and facing it the same portrait, rather clumsily touched up, from the 1631 edition of the book. In this it will be noticed that the date of death given in the inscription has been altered to 1636—five years in advance of the sad event if the Edition *was* really printed in 1631! And why alter the date without altering the age? This might perhaps be dismissed as a mistake of the engraver (who was obviously not at his best in touching up the face) but the story is not quite told. In de Larray's "Histoire" referred to above, there appears a curiously ambiguous statement regarding Bacon's death, which Dr. Gerstenberg has pointed out. In Vol. III, page 744 will be found, under "Bacon", the words . . .

"Il mourut dans sa retraite à l'âge de 76"  
(He died *in his retreat* at the age of 76)

To this is appended a marginal note . . .  
"D'autres disent de 66 Seulement"  
(others say only 66).

Certainly the marginal note serves to underline the problem, and the questions to be decided are these. Did de Larray throw doubt on this question because he *knew* something, or was he merely confused by the English portraits of 1627 and 1631? Secondly, where was Bacon's "retreat?" This could hardly have been Lord Arundel's house at Highgate to which he repaired casually when taken ill upon the road. Indeed for this acknowledged intrusion he dictated a charming letter of apology, quite in his own vein, before his decease.

\* \* \* \*

The spotlight in this issue is on De Larray's *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande* a book which seems to be unusually suggestive



in regard to three interesting questions—Bacon's birth, Bacon's death, and Lord Leicester's relationship to Queen Elizabeth. In drafting his Will Bacon specifically committed the care of his "name" to "foreign nations", and to "the next ages". Is it possible that De Larray, in 1707, became one of the custodians of that "name"?

\* \* \* \*

Baconians, as usual, have been having small luck in expressing their views in the correspondence columns of the daily press. On the Marlowe question, our own letters received no notice at all, though one from Bruno appears in our correspondence columns, as published). Mr. Wright, tired of being ignored, asked to be told the reason, and was informed that "it was not desired to re-open the question of Shakespeare authorship in the *Daily Telegraph*"! And this after a whole barrage of letters for and against Marlowe. Mr. Eagle complains of similar treatment, and we are pleased to print a letter of his to the "*Daily Mirror*" pointing out an error which the Editor is apparently ashamed to correct, and would prefer to suppress. The impartiality of the "*Daily Telegraph*" of sixty years ago, has long since vanished. Readers who are interested to know what the editorial atmosphere used to be like in a more liberal age, should refer to the correspondence published by the "*Daily Telegraph*" in the winter of 1887/88. Much of this was ably summarized by Dr. R. M. Theobald in a book called "*De-Throning Shakespeare*", copies of which are still in our library. Few of the Baconian arguments so well expressed in these pages have been met, while many orthodox arguments were exploded.

\* \* \* \*

Founded in 1886—so the caption runs, and *BACONIANA* completed its seventieth year of publication with the last issue. Our congratulations to all who have laboured to keep our magazine going for so long, and to all members, past and present, who have made this venture worth while. If we may quote the *Novum Organum* "The time we lose by not succeeding is nothing to the chances we lose by not trying".

We do not err in paying our respects to those Baconians who have passed on, for they truly served the cause, a cause which the present Editorial Board will endeavour to uphold. The spirit of Francis Bacon lives on, and while the Society draws its inspiration from such a mind and such a name, it will be the custodian of his purpose and a witness to his greatness of soul.

In 1626, thirty-two Latin poems were printed by Dr. W. Ramsden in honour of Lord Verulam, and the following lines, roughly translated from the Latin, occur to us now.

"If thou should'st seek, O Bacon, to reclaim  
All thou hast given to the Muses and the world,  
Or should'st thou wish their creditor to be,  
Then Love, the whole wide world, Jove's treasures,  
The Vault of Heaven, Prayer, Song, Incense of praise,  
E'en Grief itself shall fail and bankrupt be.

"Nature nothing has  
That can repay the debts we owe to thee".



In a recent letter Mr. Eagle has sent us confirmation that the "Jupiter-Eagle device is to be found in several other books published by Schonwetter during the period 1599-1610. Schonwetter, as Mr. Eagle informs us, was a publisher and not a printer, so the association of his family name (which means "fine weather") with "the Lord of Heaven" may be a natural one.

Evidently this symbol of "Jupiter sitting upon an eagle" was in wider use than we had supposed. Miss Horsey has found that it was even used to decorate one of the English ships at the time of the Armada (see correspondence). However its occurrence in the form of a word-picture in *Cymbeline* could have some unexplained significance.

\* \* \* \*

We are printing an unusual contribution from "Arden", who is already well-known to our readers, and is a keen bibliophile. There must surely be other Baconians who own libraries including books of "association" interest, and we would welcome articles written in the same homely style as *A Century of Books*.

\* \* \* \*

We regret that owing to pressure on space, we have had to hold over Part IV of *A Pioneer*, by our contributor M.P., but we intend to print this in the next issue.

\* \* \* \*

In answer to a request from the Chairman of the Council that a representative of the Society should be present at the opening of the Walsingham tomb, the following reply was received.

Dear Commander Pares,

Thank you for your letter of August 24th.

The proposed opening of the Walsingham Tomb to which you refer is as yet uncertain, but will definitely not take place for some time, and it is expected that only a minimum number of persons will be present. I am sorry that any additions to this list cannot be made.

There will be, of course, an adequate number of impartial observers of legal standing who will watch the proceedings, and the Press will no doubt have an opportunity to report the result.

Yours truly,

JOHN MARSHAM TOWNSHEND.

## OBITUARY

It is with deep regret that we report the death of one of our elder members, Mr. Howard Bridgewater, at the end of May. Mr. Bridgewater, a barrister, a past Chairman of the Council, and a valuable contributor to *Baconiana*, had been an active member of many years standing. One of his most useful booklets, *Evidence connecting Sir Francis Bacon with "Shakespeare"* is still available and contains important illustrations of the Northumberland Manuscript, and engraved title pages from early editions of Bacon's works.

Mr. R. L. Eagle, who knew Mr. Bridgewater well, is kindly sending us a memoir of him for the next issue of our magazine. Meanwhile, a passage from a letter written by Mr. Bridgewater a day or two before he passed on, may serve to recall his "peculiar mercury".

Now did you by chance happen to see the Asian Club feature on television on Friday last? The guest of the evening was..... and amongst the questions put to him was one asking his reaction to the opening of the Walsingham tomb. Having given a perfectly good reason why the putative authorship of "Shakespeare" was already questioned by many people—namely, the author's intimate knowledge of the Courts of Europe—he rather surprisingly went on to say that he was "one of those people who thought that the works of Shake-speare were written by Shake-speare and that those who thought otherwise were cranks"!

He should be reprimanded for so expressing himself on a subject about which he can evidently know little or nothing, and told that he would be well advised either to give serious study to this greatest of literary problems or else to confine himself to archaeological matters.

Do you not think that, pending criticism in "*Baconiana*", he might be sent a copy of Mr. Eagle's book, or my "*Evidence*"?

May, 20th 1956

For more than half a century our Society has been fortunate in its watch-dogs, men of letters or men of law (with a judge or two from time to time), who could "weigh and consider" and having done so, hold on to the deeper truth beneath the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. Failing health did not prevent our former Chairman, Mr. Bridgewater, from noticing the inconsistency of argument mentioned above. As for the platitude about Shake-speare writing Shake-speare, we can imagine Mr. Bridgewater retorting forensically, "Quite so, and the question still remains—Who *was* Shake-speare? Who was it sang, who sings?"

M.P.

# VAN DEN WEAFF'S PORTRAIT OF ELIZABETH

## A Study in Context

By PROFESSOR P. HENRION

PROFESSOR Gerstenberg's very interesting find not only provides one more, in the already long list of pointers to Queen Elizabeth's real matrimonial condition, but affords an excellent example of the paramount importance of *context*. We members of the teaching professions experience the greatest difficulty in obtaining from our students a critical sense of context, which, outside literary studies, is a most valuable asset in the business of life. To students of things Baconian in particular, the study of context is primordial. A clever use of it is often resorted to by those "in the know" in order to record truths safely, that is to say without arousing the curiosity of the general public.

Thus the innocent eye will not see anything striking in Van der Werff's portrait. "Common sense" will suggest that, to show his skill in composition and provide additional ornaments, the designer has added a few plump cherubs, a hanging drapery, and some classical properties in which the over-imaginative onlooker may well find metaphysical symbols if it so please his sophisticated humour.

But now let us look at the context. Let us open the four imposing volumes of De Larray's *Histoire d'Angleterre* to study the dozens of portraits by the same draughtsman. We shall then see whether he merely follows a whimsical decorative inspiration, or has a tendency to be systematic in his symbolism and, if so, whether we can gather something useful from his usual technique. We are soon left without doubt. All the portraits aim at being symbolical. Happily for us, there is nothing recondite in the artist's method, nothing of the baffling slyness of emblem books.

The destinies of the historical personages he depicts are always symbolized in very clear terms. Charles I lost his crown and his head. We find an upturned royal crown and an executioner's axe. Time and again these crowns and axes recur with the same obvious meaning, reminding us that the throne is often the stepping-stone to the scaffold. If a man has been unjustly put to death, he has a right to a palm, the palm of martyrdom. Cranmer and Latimer, who suffered for their faith, have palms in addition to the easily predictable wood pyre and flames. Henry VII is primarily the man who united the two roses; so two roses are given him in addition to royal crowns. Henry VIII's portrait is held by a woman, thus qualifying the lines under the portrait saying that his wild passions and *women* brought desolation to his court. Anne de Cleves has a "portrait" under her own portrait to





Portrait of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, from de Larray's  
*Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande.*



Frontispiece of "Sylva Sylvarum". 1627.



Frontispiece of "Sylva Sylvarum". 1631





recall the fact that this very plain woman had deceived, albeit unwittingly, the inflammable Henry under the false pretence of a shamelessly flattering portrait. Cherubs, if the word may be applied to wingless but angelic children, appear rather rarely but always in connection with women who bore royal children or children destined to become of note.

We know enough now to be amply justified in trying to see some meaning in the setting of Elizabeth's effigy. We know that the designer liked *simple eloquent symbols, used regularly and consistently, and never fortuitously*. As an additional piece of luck, the author gives us most valuable context, affirming in his preface to the book that "the celebrated painter wanted to illustrate<sup>1</sup> each portrait, and by figures that give it pleasant relief, give at the same time a just idea of the person".

Such a preparatory study is not idle, nor a waste of time, for now the study of Elizabeth's picture can be brief and to the point. It represents an oval portrait of the Queen, the frame of which is entwined with olive boughs (not to be mistaken for the bays of the conqueror, the fruit is much too big), symbolizing her sedulous avoidance of armed conflicts. Below the portrait is the essential feature—the altar on which, in honour of the "Virgin Queen", blaze the flames of the VESTAL FIRE<sup>2</sup>. Behind, in the dark and the smoke of the fire, lurks an obscure child, with a gentleman's hose and an orphan's cloak, who grasps in his right hand the semi-spherical extinguisher which fits the altar *focus*. The most inconvenient way in which he holds it leaves no doubt as to his gesture. He is going to cap the *focus* with it and extinguish the Vestal Fire, as our modern Vesta is no longer worthy of the name. This is the first-born child whose conception in sin invalidated the Queen's much publicized claim to maidenhood. The child is in the dark, firstly because this fact is not for public consumption, and secondly because he hardly left any name with the historians (even nowadays, the "serious" *Dictionary of National Biography* says much less than it could about him).

The other two children, half-brothers to the first, being born in wedlock, are in full light. Besides, they became men of much greater note, one a general, the other a chancellor. They have nothing to do with the Fire because their mother had long ceased to be a devotee of Vesta when she bore them. They do not even look at the portrait

<sup>1</sup>The French word is *historier* (cf. Gray's "*storied urn*"), to illustrate, so as to give the "history" of a man.

<sup>2</sup>cf. VESTA, the goddess of fire, then of domestic fire and *virginity*. To her was built the round temple in Rome by Numa Pompilius, who instituted the service of the VESTALS, patrician virgins who had to feed the VESTAL FIRE and were greatly respected for their vow of chastity. They were condemned to be whipped till their backs bled if they let the fire die, and to be walled-in alive if they broke their vow of chastity within thirty years. Nero's rape of a Vestal was resented as a revolting blasphemy by his subjects.

of their ungrateful mother<sup>1</sup>. Robert, on the left, looks his brother directly in the eye as he holds up in front of him his palm of a martyr—a martyr to his mother's unnatural relentlessness. Close scrutiny will show that he is speaking. He seems to say: this is what you did not save me from! Robert also wears a *paludamentum*, that vestment held by a clasp on the right shoulder and reserved to *imperators* (Roman commanders-in-chief). It is often used by artists to symbolize generalship as Van der Werff does here for Essex. Francis, in the middle, holds a rudder (of ancient design, notice the helm at the top left), since he was destined to hold the helm of the state, and ears of corn, since he cared for peace and prosperity more than for military adventures. No reference seems to be made to Bacon as a writer, acknowledged or unacknowledged. But, here again, context is useful. Larray, a diplomatic counsellor at the court of the king of Prussia, was more interested in the political side of history and better placed to hear about state secrets than literary ones. Though he speaks of Bacon at some length, he merely mentions *en passant* "the excellent treatises that he completed in retirement".

To conclude, Dr. Gerstenberg's discovery in this enlightening context, though not sufficient in itself to settle the case, is of the highest value. It is one more document of weight in the ever-swelling dossier of the "Virgin Queen"!

---

<sup>1</sup>I have been shown an emblem book of the 17th century (*circa* 1640, with signs of Bacon's *personal activity* at that date!) where Medea is pictured stabbing her young children. The design is exactly similar to one found in many emblem books of the 16th century, but with one remarkable difference: Medea has unmistakably taken on the easily recognizable features of Elizabeth, thus recalling to the initiates her murderous intentions concerning her new-born babes.



# A CENTURY OF BOOKS

A CAUSERIE

by ARDEN

A COLLECTION of second-hand books is almost certain to include presentation and signed copies, and items like bookplates and letters. Booksellers are aware of these added attractions for bibliophiles, and despite almost certain extra cost it is always a great temptation to replace a title with an identical volume with an "association" interest.

Occasionally, a bookseller is unaware of the significance of a signature and often enough I have alighted upon the name of a well-known Baconian of the past in a contemporary work.

Presentation copies are inevitable finds for the collector and in the many examples I note on my shelves the range spans a century from the first work published, by an Englishman, to the present year.

The earliest title so published was *Bacon and Shakespeare: An Inquiry Touching Players, Playhouses and Play-Writers*, 1857, and my copy was to "James Bain, Esq., presented by the Author", viz. William Henry Smith, Esq. Since then, Baconians have followed down the century of years, writing, publishing, and presenting copies of their works on the 'Greatest of Literary Problems' to interested friends.

And what of the echo in my copy of *Bibliography of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy with Notes and Extracts*: 1884, Cincinnati? It bears the inscription: "Mr. Wm. Henry Smith, With Compliments of W. H. Wyman" -the author. I have often wondered if these two great Baconians were in any way connected with the two firms of distributors and stationers.

Occasionally, a bookseller will over-reach himself in the matter of price. I do not regret not having purchased a copy of *Bacon Is Shakespeare* bearing the bookplate of Hugh Walpole. This ubiquitous item was marked "Very Rare. 30s." The average cost is around five shillings and the bookplate was quite impersonal. Of much more interest is a copy I have of the same author's work *The Shakespeare Myth* 1912, for the inscription reads: "Rt. Hon. The Lord Sydenham with the compliments of Edwin Durning-Lawrence". It also carries the signature, "Phyllis Sydenham 1933".

Other interesting bookplates include those of Valentine Smith, William Egbert Levison and Mrs. Henry Pott. This last is in a copy of her own work: *Did Francis Bacon Write Shakespeare? Part III*.

Mrs. Pott was the Editor of *The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies by Francis Bacon*. 1883. and she presented a copy: "To Mr. Sketchley with the Editor's Kind regards, Sept. 28th, 1883". What is more, there was an accompanying letter of great interest regarding her work and aims:

81, Cornwall Gardens, Queen's Gate, S.W.

Sept. 18th, 1883.

Dear Mr. Sketchley,

Herewith I send a copy of the *Promus* & shall be very glad if you find time to read the Introductory Chapters. It will also be a favour to me if you can interest anyone (especially young people with plenty of time & a long life before them) to help in the *neglected* side of the question, which is becoming daily more important. I mean that I want help to read, mark & annotate *all* the literature from about 1461 to 1661, in order to prove to the public, (for I have long satisfied myself), that the *Promus* entries apply to 'Shakespeare' & Bacon's prose works alone. If the young men who come to read in the library would commit to memory a couple of dozen of the small turns of speech: "Is it possible?—Not unlike—if that be so—Nothing lesse, &c." such as are to be found pp. 112-173, 445-463 & other places in the *Promus*. & if they would read with one eye open to watch for these in the course of their reading & write down chapter & line or Act & Scene, when found, we should get on. They will find a catalogue of the works which I have gone through. Of course dates *later than* 1594 will show only that the writer may have caught up an impression from B's writings & plays. If you ever find anyone willing to go into this kind of work will you ask them kindly to communicate with me, because then I will take care that we do not waste time by all turning over the same ground & hunting the same scent. I have heard that a Mr. Savile who reads for some of the big publishers, & who is learned & large-minded too, has been attracted to the subject, & is about to go into it heartily. I shall let you know if the forthcoming "Shakespeareana" is to be a two-sided publication & if so I shall ask you to advertise it. Please read *Appendix I* which I am told is very unanswerable & telling, & ought to have been put to the front,—but the book was being printed when I thought of working out my notes on the subject. I have added to Entry 409 the Salt-cellar quotation from 'Mucedorus', because I think it very curious. What can critics have thought of it? Or whence did they think that such a queer idea emanated? I am sure that nobody has ever suggested Erasmus as the source of this or of 200 other sayings often repeated in the Plays.

I have hundreds more references to add to any future edition of the *Promus*, & do not despair of someday making it a complete book of reference for all Formulries & Elegancies in Shakespeare. But you will see that this is a heavy undertaking for one rather feeble hand, besides which when I have finished the Dramatic Life, I am anxious to go off into my original lines of science, law, manners, morals, Bible & a host of other things. So if anybody, philologically disposed, will help me in the ant's work of accumulating minute facts, I shall be truly grateful. Pray caution anybody to be accurate in keeping references. When I used to read at first having no conception of the amount which I should get through, nor of the use to which I should turn my reading, I did not take half notes enough & this has entailed much unnecessary work & some imperfections in it as well. Believe me, Sincerely Yrs, Constance M. Pott."

One wonders if this most splendid of researchers and 'Editor' ever found the help she needed and what became of her notes and papers.

A link is provided with the above inside a copy of *The Shakespearean Myth*. 1881: Cincinnati, by Appleton Morgan, M.A., LL.B. This is a letter together with an inscription "Mr. Watkins Old" which was later crossed through and the signature "Frederick Harker 1891" added. The letter is addressed to Mr. Old of "21, Park Row, New York, Aug. 26th, 1883", and runs:

"My Dear Sir,

I have, with many thanks, your kind favour of 18th inst. Especially am obliged for your suggestions in my little book of..... If it shall prove itself—in its imperfect form—worthy to live—we will get at it some day and make it over—in less provincial & more permanent form—until when I shall preserve for insertion your emendations—I am most deeply impressed (though not as yet a believer in putative Baconian authorship) with the value of Mrs.

Pott's discoveries. The first reading of "Promus" by both your English & our own reviewers resulted in their swearing at its "forced parallelisms". But many of them are already beginning to see Mrs. Pott's drift—viz., that the lines of thought—not the verbiage or expression—were parallel—and I look to see her obtain entire justice yet.

Begging my compliments to Mrs. Pott & with renewed thanks for your kind letter, I am, —Dear Sir—Very obediently & faithfully, Yours—Appleton Morgan.'

Overleaf is a postscript:

"My theory is that Delia Bacon became insane—if at all—for that she died in a mad house is one of the many fictions of that irresponsible magazine writer Richard Grant White) from the reception & treatment of her theory. I should be very unwilling to admit a disbelief in W.S. as *prima facie* insanity—"

The most frequent bookplate, I find, is that of Valentine Smith, the late Secretary of the Francis Bacon Society. In my early years of membership I purchased many titles from him and a few have come from booksellers in the south of England. The bookplate is, I think, a photogravure of his home: "Thatched Cottage, Virginia Water", and strange to relate it was my purchase of a copy of *Baconiana* from Wyman's bookstall on Virginia Water S.R. station sometime in 1940 that ultimately led me to Baconianism. I carried that *Baconiana* all over the Middle East during the war years and must have read its contents many times in many deserts and camps.

But it was not until 1946 when I had to recall an article which pointed out that Fuller, the author of the famous 'Worthies' had not recorded 'as a fact' the wit-combats in the Mermaid Tavern between Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, that I paid serious attention to the Bacon Theory. This happened during a 'tutorial' and the tutor, a Cambridge M.A., did not take kindly to the correction and demanded to know my 'authority'.

At the following tutorial I produced my dog-eared *Baconiana* and towards the end of the discussion matters took an unusual turn. A second student declared himself "also a Baconian" and in the argument that followed the tutor lost his temper!

Later when I was busy trying to find out what the other student knew, the tutor came up and apologised. But his revenge was to the point! The two 'Baconians' were to produce full-scale 'essays' on the Bacon Theory; to be read at a later tutorial. What an error in tactics!

Within a few days I had a parcel of pamphlets from Valentine Smith and presentation copies of their works from Mr. Edward D. Johnson and Mr. Alfred Dodd. My 'essay' took me two months to complete. It attempted a synthesis of all the important dates relating to Francis Bacon and Shakespeare. The typescript bears the tutor's ticks of approval but they end on the second page. He found that he had not the necessary 'authorities' to hand for a complete check! Mr. Alfred Dodd came to the college and gave a 'full house' of over 300 students a most enjoyable 'background lecture'. At the opening of his address, Mr. Dodd captured his audience when, on scattering his sheaf of notes all over the stage, he blandly declared that he "didn't need them" and then proceeded to show them that he did not. In



comparison with the professional and didactic lectures we had, Alfred Dodd's address stood out like a beacon for interest and stimulation. I was often congratulated afterwards by students when they learned that I had been the cause of Mr. Dodd's visit, and I was able to sell many of his *Sonnet Diaries* in the months that followed. Yes, Valentine Smith's bookplate inevitably recalls for me my introduction to the Bacon Theory and how it occurred.

A bookplate in a copy of *The Shakespeare Enigma* by the Rev. William Sutton, S.J., Dublin, is that of Mr. Bertram G. Theobald, The Four Winds, Ovingdean, Brighton, and this has the catchline: "If lost, kindly return—Owner will reward"! His cousin, I think, Robert M. Theobald, M.A., was the author of *Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light* and evidently my copy once belonged to "George Moore, Esq.—With the Author's Respects: Oct. 20th, 1902". The second most freely offered work is *The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays* and the author, Mr. George Cox Bompas must have frequently given away copies. Two of mine bear the inscription: "Henri de Rosen" and "James G. C. Minchin" respectively. "Henry James" once owned my copy of *The Mystery of William Shakespeare: A Summary of Evidence*. 1902 by my name-sake, His Honour Judge Webb. Many inscribed names on my books are not known to me, neither have I noted them in the pages of *Baconiana*, but one item couples two well-known names besides recalling an article in our journal. This is *New Light on the Enigmas of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. 1916, by R. L. Eagle, and the inscription reads: "To Sir Herbert Tree with the Author's compliments." Works on the sonnets are legion and in a copy of *The Problem of the Shakespeare Sonnets* is the name of its anti-Baconian author: "J. M. Robertson. Xmas 1926". I was aware of this writer's work long before I met with the Bacon Theory and I always had great respect for his rationalist attitude. But he certainly received the *coup de grace* on the 'Shakespeare Problem' from the hands of Sir George Greenwood in his *Is There a Shakespeare Problem* 1916.

Anti-Baconian works loom large on my shelves for it is instructive to know the oft repeated arguments they prefer to use. It is of no use avoiding these works and it is not surprising that many are inevitably copies from the authors. The most ubiquitous of these, but by far the weakest, is *The Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy* 1902, by a 'Treasurer of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple'. My copy carries a letter which reveals some confidence on the part of the Author in his travesty of a "trial".

Sept., 1902

"Dear Mr. Walters,

I am sending you by parcel post a copy of my address—I hope that you will find in it well-nigh conclusive evidence that *Shakespeare* was the Author of the Plays. With Kind Regards, Yours sincerely,

William Willis."

I suppose many members of our Society have presentation copies which bear their own names as recipients. One such that gave me a great deal of pleasure—and still does—is a copy of Mr. Edward D.

Johnson's *Shakespearean Acrostics* 1947. This was the work that led me into that fascinating study of Bacon-Shakespeare cryptography and it was not long before I had personally checked all the items by a then prodigious purchase of a 1623 *Folio Facsimile* by Staunton, 1898. As a typographer and printer these acrostics held for me a certain positive strength especially as the mathematical odds could be calculated from the letter incidence. It was not long before I was discovering acrostic signatures for myself not published by Mr. Johnson. On enquiry I learned that a prior publication existed and he was good enough to loan me his copy of *Subtle Shining Secrecies* by William Stone Booth. In 1955 I found a copy in Bath and carried it off in triumph. It bears the following inscription:

"My Dear Mrs. King, as far as it is possible to have the first copy you have it here, in my set of approved 'proofs' including the photogravure portrait. I took them off the press myself. I have bound them so that they shall take their place 'in the purple' as they ought, on your shelves.

With grateful remembrance of your constant goodwill, Ever yours sincerely,  
William Stone Booth.  
Cambridge, Mass.

Published and copyrighted Apl. 10 1925.  
in the U.S.A. & in Great Britain."

Needless to say, most of the acrostic signatures I found belonged by prior discovery to W. S. Booth, but a careful check has shown that further signatures can still be found in the 1623 Folio.

Orthodox works on Shakespeare are also fruitful of inscriptions and the like. A small book entitled *The Alleged Vandalism at Stratford* 1903 by Sidney Lee has on the half title: "With the Author's kind regards. Dec., 22, 1903". Inserted in this book is a piece of very neat handwork. This comprises 18 pages of mounted newspaper cuttings from the *Manchester Guardian* of June 29th, 1903, and from the *Birmingham Post* of Dec. 17th, 1903.

The latter item gives a report of the legal action brought by Miss Marie Corelli, the novelist, for libel against the Trustees of the Stratford Trust. Her counsel was the famous Mr. Marshall Hall. The crux of the trouble seemed to be that Miss Corelli was forestalled by Mr. Carnegie in buying some plot of land for a 'Free Library' in Stratford. Hence when Sidney Lee returned from an American tour he sat down to write an account, the dedication of which reads: "To My Friends in America". The letter to the *Guardian* gives his point of view of the trouble which he says is the cause of "anxiety" in America.

Another association item I found in a copy of his "Life", which is now such an embarrassment to orthodoxy, was a letter-card with a printed address:

From Sir Sidney Lee, 108a, Lexham Gardens, Kensington, London. W.

2 April, 1917.

"Dear Mr. Bateman,

Could you tell whether the six copies due under the copyright Act, of my pamphlet—*Shakespeare and the Red Cross* were sent to the British Museum? Kindly let me know . . . in case the copies were not sent, inform the Manager, Chiswick Press (Charles Whittingham & Co., 20 & 21 Took's Court—Chancery Lane, London, E.C.) who will be held responsible for the default. This matter is urgent.

I should also like to know how many copies of the pamphlet were left over undistributed & where they are now.

I had a good deal of correspondence on financial matters with Mr. O'Neill, the Harvey's manager. But all is settled now. All told, I spent just £13 on the Exhibition. This pamphlet proved more costly than I foresaw. I hope the catalogue finds purchasers.

Yours truly, Sidney Lee."

The above letter-card is addressed to "R. Bateman" whose name is written on a fly-leaf of the "Life" and there is another letter to this gentleman which provides a link with another 'find' I made in Manchester:

Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 11th Feb., 1916.

"Dear Sir,

Our proceedings at Stratford will be very unpretentious. A fortnight's Festival in April, with a special performance on May 6th under Royal patronage, and probably the usual August festival.

We are not organising any special exhibition or I should have been glad to accept your kind offer.

Would Mrs. Leo Grindon not be glad to have the picture for the exhibition she is organising in Manchester?

I am, Yours truly, Stewart Duk."

The solution to the identity of the "picture" was eventually solved in a very surprising way. I had made one of my regular calls on a Manchester bookseller and was offered "something that might be of interest". The "something" turned out to be a tattered copy of *The Portraits of Shakespeare 1886, Philadelphia*, by J. Parker Norris. The spine was broken and the pages were loose, and a glance showed many notes, scribbings, cuttings, prints and letters inserted in the pages. As the item seemed full of interest and it was cheap I made the purchase. On examining the book I discovered that it had once belonged to "Mr. Bateman" and that he had set out to enlarge his collection of the 'portraits of Shakespeare'. The following letters will show what "picture" was meant:

"21, Cadogan Gardens, S.W. 9 Feb., 1913.

Dear Sir,

I do not think that this is in the proper sense a reproduction. This is I believe the original & from the 4th folio, i.e., it is from the same copper as was used for the 1st fo., but greatly worked on & worn.

It may be the 3rd fo.—but I don't think so. It is very like my 4th fo. copy.

It has at some time been stained, & then an attempt made to wash it clean, & it is of course injured and rubbed.

I'm coming to Manchester on Tuesday to Lecture on the Portraits of Shakespeare at the Art Gallery.

I wonder if I shall have the pleasure of seeing you there?

Yours truly, M. H. Spielmann.

Rt. Bateman, Esq.

In between the pages I found the print: a genuine Droeshout engraving crudely mounted on paper with a hole in the forehead where the print had been more than lightly stuck down so that although most of the engraving lifts up, a part of the forehead has come away from its surroundings.

Mr. Bateman evidently believed in obtaining a second opinion:



"Hillside, Bowden, Cheshire. Feb. 14th, 1915.

Dear Mr. Bateman,

I had an enjoyable opportunity of comparing your Shakespeare print with all the 4 editions in the Rylands Library & I came to the same conclusion that Mr. Spielmann did viz. all are from the original plate.

In the case of yours however the plate has been considerably re-worked & the impression is what the printers call 'a little flushed' by reason of a very full quantity of ink having been 'dabbed' on the plate in the process of printing.

I advise you to send to Grisbrook & have it properly cleaned & a more definite opinion can then be given.

Sincerely yours, Frank Falkner."

As I write, the print is before me. It has been trimmed to the edge and is of a uniformly dark grey aspect. The impression is sharp and clear and the 'highlights' are less in area than in the Staunton Facsimile. There is, by no means, too much ink for details in the dark parts are clear and all the cross-hatching is plain to see. There is not a trace of the "re-working" mentioned above nor does it bear the signs connected with the fourth folio. But I wonder what press-man "dabbed" this ink and took this 'pull'? The print spans over 300 years and who knows what Folio it came from? It was Sidney Lee who published many a monograph on the extant Folio copies and who, in the course of this kind of work made so many blunders that he can hardly be mentioned by modern bibliographers without criticism or hint of inaccuracy.

As illustration of this I refer to his *Notes and Additions to the Census of Copies of the Shakespeare First Folio*. 1906. On page 28 there is a footnote which begins: "Three exemplars, in addition to those named above, have been sold in London sale rooms since 1902, but they were in so fragmentary a condition that they must be excluded from any catalogue of substantial interest . . ."

This footnote is attached to item "XIV. Mr. H. R. Davis Copy." —the last in the collection. Apart from the astonishing denial of the value of attention to copies of the 1623 Folio whatever their condition, it is interesting to note the phrase, ". . . catalogue of substantial interest". Such was Lee's way of warning off his rivals!

In an earlier edition of the "Census", item "XIV" is precisely the same, word for word, including the footnote. No wonder the irate owner of item "XIV" felt obliged to write a note in my copy against the text:

"This description differs from that I gave Mr. Sidney Lee viz. that five preliminary leaves, two in "As You Like It", one in "Timon of Athens" and the six end leaves were wanting. The other 70 leaves were only defective and have been supplied in facsimile. H.R.D."

In item "XIV" Lee had said that the seventy leaves were "missing" and other of his details were inaccurate. Not to check his second edition was even a worse error for as the note by Mr. Davis makes clear it was sent to Lee before the first publication of the "Notes & Additions."

Now, modern developments in mechanical bibliography have overtaken the scholars, for folio pages can be compared visually and variations in the type-settings noted. The day is not far distant when a facsimile of the 1623 Folio will be produced bearing all the *latest*

corrected pages from Jaggard's press. Discounting the rare corrections made during press-work for reasons arising from the printing itself, and judging from the facsimiles of pages which carry marks of correction, it is obvious that the printing was extremely accurate on the whole. For purposes of comparison a folio copy in a "bad condition" is just as valuable as any other. So much for Mr. Sidney Lee.

It is appropriate here to comment that no *causerie* on books would be complete without the mention of the earliest American publication on the modern Bacon Theory: *The Philosophy of The Plays of Shakspeare Unfolded*, by Delia Bacon, 1857. My copy has the signatures of two previous owners but I found that only half the pages were uncut!

Let it be granted that this work has its difficulties for the general reader, but amongst the many hundreds of Baconian works there are many which could find their readers if only there were an up-to-date guide. A hundred years of publication surely calls for a bibliography!

### Notice to our American Members

Please note the exceptional offer of MANES VERULAMIANI advertised on page 32, at \$3. This beautifully-produced book should be in every Baconian bibliophile's Library.

# THE NAME SHAKE-SPEARE

by T. WRIGHT

WHEN at school we were taught "Shakespeare"; which in most cases meant merely committing certain selected portions to memory and possibly being told that the author was William Shakespeare who lived at Stratford-on-Avon. If at college we went on to read Literature, we perhaps came to realize that "Shakespeare" was an important factor in the foundation of the English language, and that the author must have been of profound knowledge and outstanding ability. Expecting the events and circumstances of his life to be reflected in his Works, we turned to the published biographies, and particularly to the most popular, that by Sir Sidney Lee. There we noted with surprise the marked profusion of presumptions, such as those following; also that the few known facts had nothing to do with Literature:

"Some doubt is justifiable as to the ordinarily accepted scene of his birth."

"It is hardly possible to doubt."

"There is no ground for assuming" } Occurring in

"There is every indication that." } eight

"There is a likelihood that." } consecutive lines

Never doubting, however, the orthodox belief which we were taught, we sought guidance from our mentors, but only to be shocked by their unwillingness to assist in clearing up the mystery, and their advice to ignore the question of authorship, and concentrate on the Plays. Such expediency appeared undignified, to say the least of it, if not dishonest. We did not feel reassured by Lee's assertion that all who believed in the Baconian theory were "cranks" and "monomaniacs whose madhouse chatter threatens to develop into an epidemic disease"; nor that by F. J. Furnivall in *The Leopold Shakspeare*—"The idea of Lord Bacon's having written Shakspeare's Plays can be entertained only by folk who know nothing whatever of either writer, or are crackt, or who enjoy the paradox or joke." Such bigotry, of course, rendered the orthodox belief suspect, and we dared to doubt and enquire further. If, however, Literature was not our subject, our interest in "Shakespeare" ceased with our schooling, except for occasional reading or attendance at the Play. The question of authorship would not concern us, for we would naturally continue to believe that which we were first taught. But, if suddenly challenged with the assertion that such teaching was false and our belief a myth, we would automatically indignantly repudiate such a suggestion, and stoutly affirm the orthodox belief, although knowing nothing about the matter. And such is orthodoxy: the blind enslavement to an untested belief which can be shown to be false factually.

\* \* \* \*

The enquiring student will seek his William Shakespeare in

Stratford-on-Avon, but he will not find him, for he was never there. True it is that there is a so-called "birthplace", but, even a director of the private trust which 'runs' it and collects the admission fees from deluded visitors, has stated that "the records do not indicate precisely at which house in Stratford-on-Avon William was born."<sup>1</sup> True, there is an expensively-built theatre; but no theatre existed there when the Plays were being published; in fact, the town authorities prohibited the performance of stage plays, even while the supposed author was in their midst after his supposed triumph in London; and without any protest from him. It is also true that, annually, the great and small from London and elsewhere, forgather in the town to commemorate his birth; but no such celebrations took place during the 150 years following his death, and his relatives and fellow-citizens and the world at large seemed completely unaware of his being the author of the Immortal Plays. Even the name Shakespeare, as it is in the Plays, will not be found in the records of the supposed author's family circle during his lifetime. In the Indexes of Stratford-on-Avon and Rowington, for the period 1558 to 1615 it is never found associated with him, his parents, brothers and sisters, his own children's baptisms, the marriage of his daughter Judith and his kinsman John, junior. The name does not appear in the marriage register of Stratford-on-Avon until 117 years after his death, and that of Rowington, three years after.<sup>2</sup> What the supposed author called himself we cannot know, for he never wrote his name or anything else; but we know what his contemporaries thought it to be. The baptismal register describes him as Shakspere; the marriage bond as Shagspere; the burial record as Shakspere; his father was generally given as Shaxper; an ex-master of the grammar school wrote of him as Shaxbere; his fellow-townsmen Quiney as Shackspere; and his "fellow-countryman" Hurley as Shaxper. It will be noted that in these several forms, the pronunciation of the first syllable is Shax, and not Shake as in the form used in the Plays. This varied spelling of the one name indicates that, the supposed author being unable to write or spell his name, the several scribes involved were dependent on their own interpretation of the pronunciation as they heard it. It has been argued that there is no significance in this varied spelling, because the spelling of names and even ordinary words was not then fixed. If that be so, then it must be of considerable significance that throughout forty-two separate publications of the Shakespeare Works made over a period of eighteen years up to Will Shakspere's death, only one form of name was used, consistently, and that a new one—Shakespeare.

The name first appeared in print anywhere in the Poem *Venus and Adonis*, published in 1593. It was not on the titlepage, but as signature to the dedication, in the form William Shakespeare; and this was repeated next year in the poem *Lucrece*. But two of the Plays had already been published anonymously—*King John*, Parts I and II—

<sup>1</sup>The Birmingham Daily Post, August 1948.

<sup>2</sup>Daily Telegraph, 2.5.1950 (letter from S. J. Madge).



and these and others must previously have been on the stage, for, in the dedication of the Folio, 1623, we are told that the Plays "were acted, as before they were published." This anonymity was continued after the appearance of the name in *Venus and Adonis*, as will be seen in the following sequence:

<i>Taming of a Shrew</i>	1594	Anonymous
<i>Titus Andronicus</i>	1594	do.
<i>The First part of the Con- tention (Henry VI (Part II))</i>	1594	do.
<i>The true Tragedie of Richard, Duke of Yorke (Henry VI (Part III))</i>	1595	do.
<i>Richard II</i>	1597	do.
<i>Richard III</i>	1597	do.
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	1597	do.
<i>Richard II</i> (2nd Edition)	1598	"By William Shake-speare"
<i>Richard III</i> (2nd Edition)	1598	do.
<i>Henry IV</i>	1598	Anonymous
<i>Loves Labours Lost</i>	1598	"By W. Shakespere"
<i>The Famous Victories of Henry the fifth (Henry V)</i>	1598	Anonymous
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (2nd Ed.)	1599	do.
<i>Henry IV</i> (2nd Edition)	1599	"By W. Shake-speare"
<i>The Passionate Pilgrim (Peom)</i>	1599	"By W. Shakespeare"

From this point onward to the Folio, 1623, the author's name, where given, *always* appears in the form Shakespeare, with or without the hyphen. There are eight further instances of anonymity—*Titus Andronicus*, *Henry VI*, *Henry V*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, which continue so until after Will Shakspeare's death. It is evident that the author was not anxious to reveal his identity, certainly not in the Plays, and that the form of name used was at first in doubt.

It will be noted that the first Play to bear the name was *Richard II* (2nd Edition), and that the form of name was the same as in the Poem *Venus and Adonis*, but with a hyphen. This Play, when on the stage before publication, had caused serious trouble in high places, and the special circumstances, which are referred to by Francis Bacon in his *Apophthegms* and his *Apologia concerning Essex*, have an important bearing on the question of authorship. As first played, the Play contained the scene relating to the dethronement of the reigning monarch, and this provoked the Queen's anger. The Play was then hurriedly published anonymously, with the offending scene omitted, and the Queen's anger seemed to subside. But, later, a Dr. Hayward published a sketch of the reign of Henry IV, which touched on the question of hereditary succession, and was dedicated to the disgraced Essex. The Queen was furious over this, Hayward was clapt in the Tower, and her anger over *Richard II* was renewed. The Play was then again published, and stated to be "by William Shake-speare." Meanwhile, Will Shakspeare, having become a householder and citizen of Stratford-on-Avon, seemingly disappears from London, and is neither apprehended nor questioned as to his res-

possibility for authorship. Bacon writes of this Play that it was "a matter which though it grew from me, went after about on other's names"; and of the Henry IV sketch he wrote that it was "supposed to be written by Dr. Hayward." The angry Queen sought Bacon's verdict that there was treason in the sketch, and suggested that "it was not his writing whose name was to it, but that it had some more mischievous author; and said with great indignation, that she would have him racked to produce his author." Bacon deftly turned the question and, at least, succeeded in saving his friend's head. The unfortunate Hayward languished in his prison until after the Queen's death; but Will Shakspeare went scot-free. Had the latter's name been that which was on the Play, he would most certainly have at once been apprehended, even as was Hayward, and the remoteness of his native town would have been no safety. His freedom can only mean that he was known not to be the author of *Richard II*; and that the name William Shakespeare was accepted as being the *nom de plume* of somebody else.

*Venus and Adonis*, in which the name William Shakespeare first appeared in print, was published in 1593, but there is general agreement among orthodox writers that it must have been written much earlier, some placing the date as early as 1584, and suggesting that it was written, therefore, at Stratford-on-Avon. At that time, Will Shakspeare was in his native town, aged twenty years; married, with a family of newly-born twins; occupied as butcher's apprentice; unlettered, and without the slightest evidence of any literary or cultural pursuit. Hardly the background from which, one would think, so finished a work could emerge, for the Poem is a highly classical work of 199 stanzas, written in the purest, most elegant and scholarly English of the day. Yet the orthodox belief is that Will Shakspeare was the author.

In the *Venus and Adonis* dedication, William Shakespeare refers to his Poem as "the first heir of my invention." What exactly was this "invention" of which the Poem was the first expression? Not his dramatic art, for the Plays had already been appearing. *Venus and Adonis* was, indeed, his first poem to be published, but it is difficult to think that so outstanding and finished a work came suddenly out of the blue, without there having been earlier essays in poesy, even if not published. In any case, there would be little point in thus drawing special attention to his poetry which was secondary in importance to the Plays, and was to consist of but five poems published over sixteen years. But the Poem was the first work to bear the novel name William Shakespeare, and we can only conclude that it was this feature that was the invention. However, if Will Shakspeare were the author, surely he would have signed the dedication in the form of name by which he was then known. Even if we assume it to have been possible, in those days of strict social distinction, for a butcher's apprentice so to address a leading member of the aristocracy, the Earl of Southampton would not have recognised the new signature as being that of Will Shakspeare who had not hitherto revealed his authorship, unless of course the Earl and the butcher's apprentice had previously exchanged confidences: which is absurd, as Euclid would have said. Clearly the signature was

of someone already known to the Earl and of accepted social standing, and the invention was the adoption of the name William Shakespeare as a *nom de plume*.

The name William Shakespeare having first appeared in 1593, in *Venus and Adonis*, its next appearance was the following year in the poem "Lucrece", and in the same form. That same year, 1594, occurred the first mention of the author in literature generally, and that was in a very curious work *Willobie his Avis* attributed to a mysterious author of whom nothing is known, where are the lines:—

"Yet Tarquyne pluckt his glistering grape,  
And Shake-speare, paints poore Lucrece rape".

There, also occurred the first use of the hyphen in the name. When those lines were written, it is most unlikely that their author had seen a published copy of *Lucrece*, for, less than four months separated the entries of the two works in the Stationers' Register. If that be so, he must have seen *Lucrece* in manuscript and learned first-hand that its author wrote also as "William Shake-speare". The supposed author, of Stratford-on-Avon, was never at any time during his lifetime known as Shake-speare, although plays were being published bearing that name. The use of the hyphen was then a novelty, even in ordinary words, and was not found in proper names. C. L'Estrange Ewen, writing in 1931 in *A History of Surnames of the British Isles*, stated that such use was "quite modern practice for which there is no authority". The mere position of the hyphen in the name is sufficient evidence that it was not put there by Will Shakspeare. If he had done so, he would automatically have placed it *after* the middle 's', to secure the pronunciation "shax" as then extant, little knowing that he would be etymologically correct. That this is so has been shown by C. L'Estrange Ewen in an article, *The Name Shakespeare*, written after an exhaustive research occupying several years.<sup>1</sup> In this, he sums up with the following statement.

"The strongest resulting evidence being that Shakespere is derived from a place-name, its syllables being, therefore, Shakes-pere rather than Shake-spere, as popularly supposed, the ancient pronunciation being, Shax'per."

The most common orthographic form, in the days of publication of the Plays was Shakespere, and this held good back to the 14th Century, during which the changes from an earlier form became apparent. From Shakespeyre we go back to Shakespey, and then, in the previous Century, to Sakespeye and Sakespee. In the Kent Assize Roll for 1279, which has been preserved in quadruplicate, the one person's name occurs three times as Sakespey and once as Shakespere. In the Fountains Abbey register (1196-1235), the name of one person ranges through Saxpey, Sakespey, Syakespeye and Shakespie. In 1202, the Lincolnshire Assize Rolls give the names Sakespe and De Saxeby; and the Leicestershire Pipe Rolls give De Saxeby. The majority of our surnames are derived from localities, and Mr. Ewen concludes that

<sup>1</sup>BACONIANA, No. 84 (1936) p.171.



these several variants are all forms of the place-name Saxby, which still is found in Lincolnshire and Leicestershire.

For the derivation of 'Shake-speare' we turn to William Camden's *Remains*, 1614, where in a long chapter on "Surnames" occurs the following curious paragraph:

"Some [are derived] from that which they commonly carryed, as Palmer, that is, Pilgrim, for that they carried Palms when they returned from Hierusalem: Long-sword, Broad-speare, Fortescu, that is, Strong-shield, and in some such respect, Breake-speare, Shaïke-speare; Shotbolt, Wagstaffe, Bagot, in the old Norman, the same with Scipio, that is a stay or walking staffe with the Latines, which became a surname, for that Cornelius served as a stay to his blind father . . ."

There, is the definite statement that the derivation of the name Shake-speare is from the carrying or shaking of a spear—not from a place-name as we saw Shakspere, the name of the supposed author, to be. These two names then are quite different etymologically, and must not be confused as alternatives of the one name. As the name Shake-speare had never before existed, and now was known only as that of the author of "Shakespeare", Camden must here be referring to that author. Moreover, being King-of-Arms and therefore an authority on names, he would be fully aware that the name was not a proper surname but a *nom de plume*: its inclusion in the chapter on "Surnames" is one of the several strange things found here and in the book generally. The ornamental heading to the chapter bears the cryptic double-A design and is printed upside-down—a sure sign in Elizabethan literature of hidden meaning. The opening lines of the chapter recount how Romulus, first King of Rome, was the first to take a surname, which was "the Sabine name of Quirinus, because he used to carry a speare, which the Sabines called Quiris." After a general reference, it is stated that "every town, village or hamlet (in England and Scotland) hath afforded names to families," and many pages of examples are given. Despite this exhaustive treatment, there then occurs the following paragraph with its extravagant emphasis:

"Neither was there, as I said before or is there, any Town, Village, Hamlet, or place in England, but hath made names to Families so that many names are local which do not seem so, because the places are unknown to most men, and all known to no one man: as who would imagine Whitegift, Powlet, Bacon, Creping, Alshop, Tirwhit, Antrobus, Heather, Hartshorne and many such like to be local names? and yet most certainly they are."

Of this short selection of nine examples, the first three are directly connected with Francis Bacon: Whitgift was his tutor at Cambridge who later, as Archbishop of Canterbury, licensed the publication of *Venus and Adonis* in which the name William Shakespeare first appeared: it was under Paulet's diplomatic tutelage that Bacon was sent by the Queen to the Court of Henry III of France; and at least two of the rest had indirect connection. Further on in this chapter Christian Names are mentioned, although these had already been exhaustively treated in three chapters; and here "Francis" is the first name men-

tioned. Similarly, in a paragraph on "Nicknames or Nursenames", the first example given is "Bill or Will for William." In a chapter on "Poems", William Shakespeare (without the hyphen) is mentioned in a list of eleven outstanding poets of the day, but is placed last, while in the fifth and sixth places respectively are Hugh Holland who, in the Folio, was to describe the author as "Poets King", and Ben Jonson who was to call him the "Star of Poets". Finally, in a chapter on "Impresses", Camden writes of his "learned Friend" who devised for him "Pallas's defensive Shield with Gorgon's head thereon."

There is little doubt that Camden's "learned Friend" was Francis Bacon. He was a close friend, and we know that Camden's most important work, *Annals of Elizabeth*, was not published until after Bacon had read the manuscript and made certain alterations and additions. Whether Bacon also had a hand in the publication of the *Remains* we do not know; but the incidence of the several items to which attention has here been drawn, leads one to the conviction that he must have done. There is some remarkable supporting evidence of this in that mysterious book on Cryptography published on the Continent at Luneburg in 1624, and attributed to Gustavus Selenus, *alias* Trithemius, *alias* Man in the Moon. This book was fathered by the Duke of Brunswick and dedicated to "Dr. Francisco, Antonio, London, Anglo, Seniori," which fully identifies Francis and Anthony Bacon. The author refers to Camden's *Remains* and to Francis Bacon's part in the production of *Annals of Elizabeth*; but it is the titlepage that is of greatest significance, for there is disclosed the truth concerning the authorship of "Shakespeare". This titlepage consists of four pictorial panels, each drawn in great detail, not at the whim of the engraver, but under the precise directions of the Duke of Brunswick, and thus they were intended to serve a definite purpose. J. Phinney Baxter states in *The Greatest of Literary Problems* that these instructions are still extant and have been read by him. If my reader would enjoy the fascination of profitable detective investigation, let him give this titlepage his close attention and arrive at his own solution. There are excellent enlargements of the four panels, in Sir E. Durning-Lawrence's *Bacon is Shakespeare*, 1910, and reference should also be made to BACONIANA No. 137 (1950), p. 205. It is suggested that there will be detected the Duke of Brunswick placing the cap of maintenance upon the head of Francis Bacon, who is seated and writing some document of Folio size; and Bacon in a rural setting, handing some document to the rustic actor Will Shakspeare, who is seen journeying on foot to some city. Also to be seen are the long-sword, broad-spear, shotbolt, wagstaff and walking staff, all of which are mentioned in that one paragraph in Camden's *Remains*, referred to above. Yet further will be seen, the actor now well-mounted on horseback, but with a spur exaggeratedly drawn.

Why should a foreign prince thus devote the titlepage of his serious work on Cryptography, printed and published abroad, to the authorship of the English "Shakespeare"? Why refer to an insignificant work, not on Cryptography, by the Englishman Camden, and mention

that the latter's most important work was finally edited by Francis Bacon? The explanation is, of course, that the Duke of Brunswick and Camden were members of that secret society which Bacon had created, for the working out of his life's ideal—the advancement of learning, of which "Shakespeare" was an integral part. In *BACONIANA*, No. 137, above referred to, is shown a remarkable composite portrait, which is in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris. Ostensibly, it is a variant of the authentic portrait of the Duke of Brunswick, having the same setting and surroundings, but only half of the face and body represent the Duke. In the other half—the right-hand side, the face is that of Francis Bacon, as seen in the Van Somer portrait of him, while the body is clothed in an impossible 'left-handed' coat, as in the so-called portrait of William Shakespeare by Droeshout, in the *Shakespeare Folio*. The opinion of an expert iconographer, John Clennell, is that this composite picture was done by one or more of the Dutch artists, the Van Somer brothers or Daniel Metteus, and engraved by the Droeshout group. Such infinite trouble would not have been taken without some definite purpose, and that could only have been to direct attention to the close liaison that existed between Francis Bacon, William Shakespeare and the Duke; and to the last-named's book, where Camden also is introduced, and the title-page reveals Francis Bacon's use of Will Shakspeare as a mask.

There is contemporary evidence that, before the first appearance of the name William Shakespeare, in 1593, it was known that some obscure author was using that name. The chief dramatic writers of the day bitterly attacked certain "vainglorious tragedians," and also their "idiot art masters", that were trespassing upon what they considered to be their preserves; and, by 1592, the attack became centred on one person who was represented as being an—

"upstart Crow beautified with our Feathers, that with his Tygers heart wrapt in a Player's hyde supposes he is as well able to bombast out a Blanke-verse as the best of you [*i.e.* you writers], and being an absolute Johannes Factotum, is in his owne conceyt the onely Shake-scene in a Countrey."—(*Robert Greene*)

The reference to "Tygers heart" is a quotation from the Shakespeare Play *Henry VI*, but with the substitution of "Player's hyde" for "Woman's hyde". It is generally accepted that the unique use of the word Shake-scene here, is a parody on the name Shake-speare; and the orthodox mind, having predetermined that Will Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon was the William Shake-speare of the Plays, has taken it for granted that he is meant. But that is to ignore the complete absence of any direct evidence that Will Shakspeare ever wrote a single line of anything, and so could not possibly be the *writer* whom Greene was obviously attacking. In the Public Records Office is an appeal made in 1635 by the Burbage brothers, who had employed Will Shakspeare at the Globe and Blackfriars theatres. The appeal is addressed to the Earl of Pembroke, the same to whom the Shakespeare Folio had been dedicated twelve years before; but, though writing nineteen years after Shakspeare's death, the Burbage brothers can find no more to say of



the latter than that he was a "deserving man", a "man player". Yet, in the Folio, the author had been described to this same Earl, as "Soul of the Age", "Star of Poets" and "Poets King". Obviously, Will Shakspeare was not the same person as the author of the Plays. Greene was addressing his fellow writers about a certain other writer, and not an actor, and there can be little doubt that he meant Francis Bacon. As the "upstart Crow" Bacon was the black-robed lawyer of Gray's Inn who had dared to set himself up as a dramatist: as the "Johannes Factotum"—or "John-do-Everything", he had made *all* knowledge his province, as he told Lord Burleigh, bringing under review every conceivable subject, ancient and modern, domestic and foreign, including the drama: as the "only Shake-scene in a Country" he had introduced a new type of play that was ousting their own. Bacon's activities in drama were no secret: those at Gray's Inn are well known, and included the first appearance of the play later to be known as *The Comedy of Errors*. His writings show the importance he attached to the stage as a powerful instrument for good, and the advice there given can be seen reflected in Hamlet's directions to the players in that play.

\* \* \* \*

The name Shake-speare, as a *nom de plume*, naturally suggests a spear-shaker and the great classical figure Pallas Athene, "The Brandisher of the Spear", as the Greek-English lexicon describes her. Her famous statue<sup>1</sup> with its golden spear dominated Athens from the heights of the Acropolis, and the Athenians looked up to her as the all-wise; the preserver of law and order, and the patroness of learning and the arts, her spear being directed against the evil of ignorance. We find the name of Francis Bacon much coupled with that of Pallas Athene, and there is good reason for believing that the ideal of her attributes inspired him, and that, possibly, he regarded her as his prototype in the great cause to which he had devoted his life. In the Lambeth Palace Library are two original documents bearing on this idea. One is a sonnet<sup>2</sup> in French, addressed to "Monsieur Francois Bacon" and signed "La Jessee." In this, the writer says that though men may praise his own Muse, all his admiration is for Bacon's Pallas ["vostre Pallas"] who made Bacon's clear virtue to shine, while his own was in the shade. La Jessee was secretary to the Duke of Alençon, who, from 1574 to 1584, was suitor to Queen Elizabeth; and Francis Bacon, when a young man, must have met him at the Court of the King of France, to which Bacon was sent by the Queen. No literary work of any importance by Bacon had so far appeared, yet, evidently, he is known in France as being inspired by Pallas Athene, and to have written poetry of exceptional merit. In the other document, we see Bacon impersonating Pallas Athene. It is a device<sup>3</sup> written by him for use before the Queen by Essex, being a sequel to a former device on the

<sup>1</sup>A reproduction of the statue surmounts The Athenaeum Club, Pall Mall, London.

<sup>2</sup>MS.653, Item 154.

<sup>3</sup>Gibson Papers, Vol. v, No. 118

same theme. In the form of a letter addressed to the Queen by Philautia, Goddess of Self-Love, it deals particularly with some advice already tendered to the Queen. The letter is in Bacon's handwriting, as also are the marginal notes intended only for Essex, and it is clear that Bacon is equally interested in furthering the advice, for which purpose he impersonates Pallas Athene.

These two documents are not dated, but we may safely assign them to Bacon's earlier years; and, for his later life, turn to the *Manes Verulamiani*. That unique publication comprises thirty-two poetic elegies, written shortly after Francis Bacon's death, by leading scholars of the day, including among others an Archbishop, two Bishops, a Dean, two Royal Chaplains and a Regius Professor of Divinity. The elegies are written in terms of the highest possible praise, mainly showing Bacon to have been the supreme poet votary of Apollo and the Muses; and the inspiration of Pallas Athene can be seen in the following excerpts (as translated from the Latin):

"Than whom no inhabitant of Earth was master of greater intellectual gifts; nor does any survivor so skilfully unite Themis and Pallas."

(No. 5)

"If any progeny recalls their sire, not of the body is it, but born, so to speak, of the brain, as Minerva [Pallas] from Jove's" (No. 7)

"Those glorious memorials of all the ages composed by your genius and by Minerva." (No. 9)

"The ardour of his noble heart could bear no longer that you, divine Minerva, should be despised." (No. 32)

"Pallas too, now arrayed in a new robe, paces forth." (No. 32)

Surely there could not have been a person more justified than was Bacon, in adopting the *nom de plume* Shake-speare. But, why were not these elegies written, ten years before, at the death of Will Shakspeare, the supposed author of the world's greatest poetry? On that occasion, no single writer mourned his going or penned his praise, and, very ordinary man that he was, he passed from the world's stage unsung and soon to be forgotten.

Another feature stressed in the elegies was Francis Bacon's activity in literature—"Supreme both in eloquence and writing under every head renowned": he "enriched the ages with crowds of books": "you have filled the world with your writings." Yet the number of books bearing Bacon's name is comparatively small, and they certainly would not fill the world, or even account for his indefatigable industry in that direction. Clearly, he must have written as a "concealed poet", as he once described himself to King James, and hidden his authorship under a *nom de plume* or behind other men's names. True it is that, during a period roughly synchronizing with the adult life of Francis Bacon, and then only, there flooded in upon the Elizabethan scene volume after volume, from ponderous folios to small octavos, translations and works on every subject; some anonymous and others attributed to writers comparatively unknown to literature. There was no public demand to justify this revival of learning, and even at the two universities there was no evidence of any special interest in science,

learning and the highest culture. The orthodox reaction to this problem is seen in the following excerpt from *The Intermediate Text-book of English Literature*, Vol. II, by W. H. Low. "We cannot hope to fully understand why in the latter half of Queen Elizabeth's reign we have a whole company of men to each of whom we can without exaggeration give the name of genius"—truly a case of the blind leading the blind! There must, of course, be an explanation that can be fully understood, and, if it cannot be found within the pale of orthodoxy, one must venture beyond. But, having thus ventured, it will be seen that this spontaneous revival of learning could not possibly have been sporadic, but was the ordered planning of one great controlling mind. The works of the supposed other geniuses will be seen to dovetail into Francis Bacon's vast scheme for the Advancement of Learning, of which the Immortal Plays were an integral part: he being, in fact, "William Shake-speare."



## "TOWARDS A MORE CORRECT BIOGRAPHY OF FRANCIS BACON"

(Extracts from an Essay by the late Parker Woodward)

### III

#### **The Faerie Queene 1589/90"**

**T**HIS year the "Faerie Queene," long overdue, was published. It was title-paged to the official named Edmund Spenser long ago settled in Ireland. There are two alleged portraits of Spenser, but neither corresponds with Aubrey's account of him—"a little man, wore short haire, little band, and little cuffs."

It almost looks as if Aubrey knew something and sought to belittle Spenser. That is not the purpose here. Beyond permitting his name to be used, the Irish official never attempted in any way to claim authorship of this great Elizabethan poem. In that respect he behaved like the Stratford player in regard to plays published in his name. Francis may have printed anonymously the tragedy of "Tamburlaine" and an "Elegy" on the death of his old friend Sir Francis Walsingham, which was printed in the name of "Watson." Walsingham knew well the great literary ability of young Francis as, not long before, he had obtained his aid in writing—probably in French—an important letter to M. Critoy, one of the French Secretaries of State, refuting slanderous allegations of Catholics abroad of ill-treatment by the Queen of her Catholic subjects. The survival of the draft amongst Francis "Bacon's" papers was probably due to its having first been composed in English.

Francis appears to have gone abroad in the summer of this year, possibly with a view to countering and refuting libels about the Queen. Sir Thomas Bodley was then at the Hague, Sir Edward Wootton not available, and Walsingham no longer alive. Francis knew French and Italian, and was a skilled diplomatist. The evidence as to this journey, which seems to have had the Republic of Venice for its ultimate objective, is to be gathered from "Never too Late" or "Francesco's fortunes, 1st Part" (G) 1590. From this it may be supposed that his itinerary was by way of Dover, Calais, Paris (where he visited the French Court), Lyons; then by the Alps into Germany, on to Vienna, and then to Venice. The trade route from Vienna to Venice was then through Innsbruck, Botzena, Trient, Verona and Padua.

In the preface to an anonymous pamphlet, "An Almond for Parratt," printed about 1590/1 in connection with the Marprelate discussion, the writer says, "Coming from Venice last summer, taking Bergamo on my way home."

In "Never too Late" the writer related the Palmer's tale as being told to him while he was staying at Bergame. The internal evidence

of "An Almond for a Parrat" suggests that its author was Francis. It may be supposed that at Bergano he was on his way home from Venice, and would go through Coire and other towns to the River Elbe, on which a boat would take him to the river mouth at Stade where the coast is flat, sandy, and shallow. In the preface to "A Prognostication" (N) 1591/2 the author mentions Dover Cliffs, and also the gathering of Danske crows on the sands of the shore in "anticipation" of storms. The latter observation suggests the extensive sands round Stade. In "Pierce Pennilesse" (N) 1592, he mentions the swaggering and drinking habits of the Germans and Danes. Dover Cliffs are graphically represented in *King Lear*, and the drinking habits of the Teutons are mentioned in *Othello*. Incidentally Gabriel Harvey in "Pierce's Superogation" said that "Nash," "Lyly," and "Greene" were three faces in one hood, and that they were a three-handed Cerberus.

### Financial Troubles, 1590-1

Francis had now worked eleven arduous years upon his self imposed task of developing English literature. Owing to his relationship with the Queen, he had to take immense pains to conceal his extensive authorship. It was an age of great literary endeavour. His contemporary, Lope de Vega, the Spanish dramatist (1562/1635), contrived in his own lifetime to write, and compose verse for, nearly two thousand plays for the Spanish stage. The trouble with Francis was largely financial. The suit—the mysterious suit which he is to be found pressing from time to time upon the Earl of Leicester, Lord Burleigh, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Christopher Hatton, and confidentially upon others of influence with the Queen—must have been for financial help, of a permanent kind for his literary schemes. What precisely these schemes were could not, in an age of intrigue and suspicion, have been safely committed to writing. But the gentlemen confidentially addressed must have known to some degree at least the secret of this "suit" though it was important that the general public should remain in ignorance. Francis was becoming extremely tired of suing for the help needed. Yet he hammered away with that extraordinary persistency which characterized all his doings throughout life. In February Ambrose, Earl of Warwick, died. Sir Christopher Hatton died the following November. So he made his celebrated appeal to Lord Burleigh for some office of quick revenue which would give him "commandment of more wits" than his own. He tried to make it clear to Burleigh that he had vast contemplative ends but moderate civil ends, and that he did not seek or affect any place wherunto "any that is nearer unto your Lordship shall be concurrent." He affirmed that if his Lordship would not carry him on, he should sell what he had and give up all care of service (meaning service to the Queen), and become some "sorry bookmaker or a true pioneer in that mine of truth which (Anaxagoras) said lay so deep." This letter was written from Gray's Inn. Note how carefully he assured Burleigh that the advancement of the Cecil sons should not be interfered with.

Like all merry-minded men, Francis could be very serious at times and often greatly depressed.

Early in the year he printed in the name of "Lodge" the euphuistic tale of "Rosalynde," based on the "Arcadia" of the Italian Sanazaro. Incident was borrowed from the fourteenth century "Tale of Gamelyn", which Chaucer, in his time, intended to make use of. Lodge, his vizard, who had gone to sea to the Azores in 1587, had not returned, so the play of "As you Like It" could be based on his own versions of other stories. The same applies to "Twelfth Night", and also to "Winter's Tale," which is based on one of the tales fathered upon Greene—"Dorastus and Fawnia."

*(To be continued).*

### Price Reduction

## MANES VERULAMIANI

will be offered at one guinea  
only while surplus copies are  
being cleared. Postage 6d. extra

---

Individually numbered copies  
are included



### SOME NOTES ON BACONIANA: III

EXPERIENCE and logic tell us that a cause embodying an aspect of Truth will always attract supporters who will ensure continuity, unless and until the need for existence ceases. This comment is certainly applicable to this Society, which has continued to function since its foundation in the last century, and has always attracted men and women who feel the urge to vindicate the good name of Francis Bacon, and tell an unbelieving world the facts, as far as they have been discovered, concerning this extraordinary genius. Bacon himself foresaw the time when the aura of mystery surrounding his life and literary works would finally be brought to the light of day, and we feel that our present struggles are of some help in bringing to pass that long-awaited *dénouement*. We cannot but note with satisfaction that during the terrible years of 1914/7 BACONIANA continued to appear. Starting from No. 48 in October, 1914, ten magazines were printed up to October, 1917, although the last two incorporated two issues each, thus bringing the Serial number to 60. The subjects were not unlike those under discussion at the present day, and included *Don Quixote*, *Did Bacon Die in 1626?*, *The Spelling of Shakespeare's Name*, and an article on Sir Walter Raleigh and the *History of the World*. After a lapse in 1918, BACONIANA appeared again in August, 1919, and there is a letter from Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame whom Count de Randwyck quoted in our correspondence columns recently on the question of Bacon's "death" in 1626!

We are mainly concerned, however, to draw our readers' attention to a contribution in BACONIANA, No. 50, called *Tenison's Baconiana*, 1679, which dovetails neatly with the interesting article by Mr. Bunnett, which we printed last time, and also serves to underline the prominent part played by Mr. Parker Woodward in Baconian affairs in years gone by. Mr. Woodward believed that Tenison was hinting that Bacon was the real author of the Shakespeare manuscripts, and certainly a prominent churchman would not commit himself to print without due consideration of his responsibility (even though he was not writing *ex officio*.) *En passant*, it may be mentioned that Archbishop Tenison's portrait may be seen, in company with his peers, in Lambeth Palace today. A collection of his papers is also preserved there.

NOEL FERMOR

## TENISON'S BACONIANA, 1679

**I**N the period 1616 to 1709 Shakespere, the deserving man of Stratford met with scant attention. After the mystifying 1623 Folio of certain Shakespeare Plays silence was maintained, except that in 1632 again, in 1664, and finally in 1684, the 1623 Folio was reprinted. As to who was responsible for its reproduction there was nothing to show. It seemed as though the reading public were to be dosed with the Tome whether they wanted it or not.

In 1640 some unknown person or persons caused to be reprinted the Shakespeare sonnets, having for frontispiece an ambiguous portrait by Marshall with a bewildering verse below it.

Five sonnets are omitted, the original numbers of which totalled 287.

With regard to another supposed poet, one Spenser, editions of poems appeared from unexplained sources, unless we are to suppose them purely publisher's ventures.

In 1679 a big Tome of the Spenser poems was printed without explanations, having for frontispiece an engraving of the "Spenser" monument in Westminster Abbey. Some unknown added a so-called account of the Life of Spenser, exhibiting several curious ambiguities and telling little or nothing of the man who living most of his life in Ireland, was yet affirmed to have written many long and very excellent poems published in England.

In 1709 one Rowe, a poet, holding the official position of Poet Laureate, published the Shakesperean plays as revised and edited by himself. He added a first and ridiculously empty account of the life of the supposed dramatic author, affirming the top of the actor author's performance to have been that of ghost in his own Hamlet (hamlet) and making no reference whatever to the sonnets and other poems. In its way the attitude of the wits of the 17th century was similar to what we sometimes hear today. We have the poems and plays and what does it matter who wrote them?

In the case, however, of Francis Bacon the pundits of the 17th century adopted an entirely different attitude. Universally they recognised him as the one great man of the Age. Tenison compared him to the Phoenix whom Nature gives the world but once in five hundred years.

Dr. Rawley printed in 1657 an account of Bacon's life. Sir William Dugdale another account in 1675. Archbishop Tenison a longer account still in 1679, Stephens another in 1702, while Blackbourne collected and published in 1730 all the various accounts of the great man's life and all his acknowledged writings except very few. Mallet about 1740 published another Life of Bacon.

Notice of Bacon's death and works did not have to wait seven years.

In 1626 a chorus of poetical lamentations came from thirty-three

persons and Rawley said he had reserved from print a considerable number of other and better contributions. Poets like Ben Jonson, Waller and Cowley subsequently expressed their high opinion of the great Verulam. Other writers such as Tobie Mathew, Osborne and Powell, divines and high officials such as Bishop Wilkins, Dr. Rawley, Dr. Glanvil, Dr. Sprat, Sir William Dugdale, Archbishop Tenison and Mr. Stephens, all in their turns gave expression in print to high encomiums concerning him. Although all his acknowledged writings of any size had been printed by 1627, his letters, speeches, scraps and memoranda were printed at intervals in small portions as though they were precious ointments. (This was before the age when publishers and literary men had committed intellectual "hara kiri" by lecturing on Shakespeare and "editing" him for the use of schools and universities.) Rawley published Bacon's Miscellany Works, 1630. Latin versions, 1638; Resuscitatio, 1657; Opuscula, 1658. An unknown contributed "Remains," 1640. Tenison after consulting with "Learned and Prudent Men" supplied more scrappy "Remains" in 1679. Stephens printed books of carefully selected letters and more Baconian scraps in 1702 and 1734. There really must have been a big demand for these things. One can surely say this from the number of copies which defying the attrition of time have reached the custody of the secondhand bookseller of today.

I must not omit the Amsterdam publication by Gruter in 1653, "Scripta in Naturali," &c., which contained nineteen of Bacon's MSS., entrusted by Sir Wm. Boswell to Gruter before 1649. Gruter had then many other important private documents which he was very keen to print, but which presumably afterwards reached safe English custody.

I hold a strong opinion that Tenison and many other men knew well that Bacon was author both of Spenser's poems and of Shakespeare's plays, and that the Folio Plays were intended to form part—necessarily secret, because secrecy was essential to Bacon's scheme of teaching philosophy aphoristically, through the medium of the plays—of his Great Instauration.

Tenison seems to have obtained possession of a Will of Lord Bacon described as his last. It does not agree with the terms of the 1625 Will in certain respects, viz.: 1. Advice as to MS. and unfinished fragments was to be sought of Mr. Selden and Mr. Herbert. 2. The Elegie in felicem Memoriam Elizabethae was to be published. 3. In addition to £100 Bacon is said to have bequeathed to Rawley, "the great Bibles of the King of Spain."

The 1679 Remains in themselves offer no ostensible reason for publication.

Tenison leaves a notable gap on page 49 where he makes bold to affirm that Bacon projected and intended as part of his Instauration, Instances and Examples for a particular Explication and Application of the Second Part. In the "Shakespeare Enigma" the Revd. W. A. Sutton has a useful suggestion as to the Shakespeare Folio Plays and their connection with the Instauration. The interesting thing is that Tenison *affirmed that he knew what was intended*, and very obscurely



hinted at what the missing part consisted of. It is a suspicious circumstance that Tenison, at page 16, for a simile to Bacon's misfortunes quoted the *Tempest* whereby Sir George Summers was cast upon the Bermudas which *Mariners* esteemed an inaccessible and enchanted place, and which was also a fruitful region. The *Tempest* is the first of the Folio Shakespeare plays, and is in its text associated with the Bermudas. (Bermoothes.)

Note also on page 73 Tenison's ambiguous references to Bacon's judgment of and performances in Poetry. Overleaf Tenison almost betrays what was passing through his mind. He refers to a certain edition as claimed to be:—

"Purged of all faults"

and suggests it cannot be purged unless the whole volume be made one entire *Blot*.

This is oddly reminiscent of Heminge's and Condell's address in the Shakespeare Folio:—

"Cur'd and perfect in their limbs

Scarce received from him a blot in his papers."

On the same page Tenison writes:—"Posterity (I hope) will do his Lordship Honour and Benefit to themselves in a larger and more accurate Collection of his Works."

It is a fair assumption that Tenison had upon his mind a far off day when the Shakespeare Folio having fulfilled its great educational experiment, would be given its fit place in "a larger and more accurate" edition of Bacon's works.

Tenison lived in an intelligent age, but one cannot credit that he and the learned and prudent men consulted would have considered suitable for publication the inconsequent and rubbishy scraps from Bacon's papers collected in the 1679 Remains.

The likely alternative is that they merely form the outward framework of an ingenious ciphered message.

This view finds support in the very curious words and phrases one meets with at the very outset of the collection, such as:— "Sanctuaries" "best King in the world," "Vault," "Stage," "Actor," "brought to light," "within a curtain and after came forth," "the glory of God is to conceal a thing and the glory of a King is to find it out," "Keys," "some degrees of light," "Wheel of Justice," "by the means of some discreet Divines," "Secrets," "Secrets," "Tower," "Tower."

It may therefore well be that Baconiana 1679, of which many copies would seem to have been printed, waits for its cryptic communications to be mastered by someone of sufficient patience and sharpness to pierce the veil. One last point. Bacon, in his "De Augmentis," mentions Kay ciphers. Now according to a clue which need not be further alluded to here the Kay cipher was so called because K was the first letter of the Elizabethan alphabet to be expressed by two numerals, viz., 10. In this Z was 24. But instead of counting A as 25, two nulls were introduced before A. which thus became 27. The Kay cipher

count of Shakespeare is 259, thus—S18, H34, A27, K10, E31, S18, P15, E31, A27, R17, E31, total 259.

In Baconiana, 1679, page number 259, is followed by the words, "That is Francis Bacon."

My conclusion is that Tenison knew when he published Baconiana that Bacon had written the Folio plays, that they formed an important part of his scheme of instruction, and that he had desired his secret to be kept until a future age. It is probable that the "Will" from which Tenison quoted constituted a private set of instructions to the men in Bacon's confidence. It is probable also that Bacon anticipated the likelihood that some would be unable to keep the secret and provided the safety valve of a method of disclosure in cipher.

PARKER WOODWARD

## *New Publications*

### *Prices*

*(including British postage)*

R. L. EAGLE

### BACON OR SHAKESPERE

A Guide to the Problem 2/11

EDWARD D. JOHNSON

WILL SHAKESPERE OF STRATFORD 3/11

FRANCIS BACON OF ST. ALBANS 3/11

MRS. B. POGSON

IN THE EAST MY PLEASURE LIES 9/6

ROMEO AND JULIET 3/-

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL 3/-

M. A. WITNEY

FRANCIS BACON 2/8

---

All are publications of great interest to Baconian students.

# FRANCIS BACON AS ESSAYIST AND ORATOR

by R. J. W. GENTRY

*"The Perfection of the Precepts of Eloquence"*

## I

**B**Y far the best known of Francis Bacon's writings are his *Essays*, yet it is ironical that the works by which he himself laid the greatest store—the *Novum Organum* and its associated philosophical treatises—as being the vital instrument for achieving the 'relief of man's estate', are read in full only by a few students with specialised interests. In the last edition of the *Essays* of his own lifetime, viz. that of 1625, Bacon speaks of them as having been the 'most current' of all his works; "for that, as it seems, they come home to men's business and bosoms". Three years earlier, in a letter to his friend, Bishop Andrewes, he describes his *Essays* as only the 'recreations' of his studies; but that he was already conscious of their potential lastingness he reveals in a subsequent sentence: "I am not ignorant that these kind of writings would, with less pains and embracement, perhaps yield more lustre and reputation to my name than those other which I have in hand."

Douglas Bush makes this comment on the foregoing: "In spite of Bacon's disclaimer . . . the essays were not merely the casual recreations of a busy life, they were to a great extent an integral part of the *Instauratio Magna*, an appendix—as innumerable borrowings remind us—to the *Advancement*. Bacon wished to fill a gap in practical psychology and ethics, to contribute to that realistic knowledge of the genus *homo* without which the individual cannot prescribe for his own needs nor the statesman for the needs of society. Thus it is not simply the limitations of the essayist's mind and heart which lead him to see life so much in terms of tangible success and failure. Even when he reveals a Jonsonian world of politic knaves and gulls he can claim a philosophic purpose. In the *Advancement* he notes the lack of serious studies of professional frauds and vices, a kind of knowledge which is 'one of the best fortifications for honesty and vertue that can be planted', and he pays tribute to 'Macciavel & others that write what men doe and not what they ought to do'.<sup>1</sup>

But there is some point to Bacon's phrase 'recreations of my studies'; the habit he evidently had of recording his views and opinions upon men and life, as a diversion, was one that immediately indicates his contemplative, yet observant, disposition, and his careful husbanding of his time. That the habit began in his early life is without question for in the *Advancement* he speaks of the great advantage of compiling *sententiae* from one's reading into a kind of private notebook for eventual use in literary creation or the conduct of life itself. In the Second Book he writes: "I hold the entry of commonplaces to be a matter of great use and essence in invention, and contracteth judgement to a

---

<sup>1</sup>*English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*

strength. But this is true, that of the methods of common-places that I have seen, there is none of any sufficient worth: all of them carrying merely the face of a school, and not of a world; and referring to vulgar matters and pedantical divisions, without all life or respect to action."

There is in the British Museum (Harleian) Collection, a kind of manuscript commonplace book in Bacon's own hand (except for some French proverbs) comprising fifty sheets (numbered 83 to 132) and containing some 1680 entries. The full title is given on one of the sheets (folio 114) as "Formularies, Promus. 27 Jan. 1595" and "fragments of Elegancies", ("promus" meaning the kind of collection which Bacon recommends in the *Advancement*, viz. a "provision or store for the furniture of speech and readiness of invention"). Regarding "invention" itself, he says: "The invention of speech or argument is not properly an invention, for to invent is to discover that we know not, and not to recover or resummon that which we already know; and the use of this invention is no other but out of the knowledge whereof our mind is already possessed to draw forth, or call before us, that which may be pertinent to the purpose which we take into our consideration. So as to speak truly, it is no invention, but a remembrance or suggestion, with an application . . . To procure this ready use of knowledge there are two courses: preparation and suggestion. The former of these seemeth scarcely a part of knowledge, consisting of diligence than of any artificial condition . . . The other part of invention, which I term suggestion, doth assign and direct us to certain marks and places, which may excite our mind to return and produce such knowledge as it hath formerly collected, to the end we may make use thereof."

Some mixed notes of the *Promus* made from classical authors, the Bible, Erasmus' *Adagia*, Italian, Spanish, French and English proverbs, and Heyward's *Epigrams*, would appear to show that the compiler had long been cogitating such abstract subjects as virtue, justice, hope, counsel, folly, anger, strength, grief, joy, life, death, etc.—the very subjects treated of in the *Essays*. Evidently, then, the thoughts that were to be developed in maturity were dwelt upon early, and the notes represent 'suggestion' which 'assigned and directed' Bacon back to such reflexions as he had previously seen fit to make, helping him also to fresh trains of thought and the turning of new expressions.

An incidental point of interest, which Spedding makes, is Bacon's habit of altering his quotations slightly, with the intention of bringing out some aspect of thought suggested to him by the original author's words, but not covered by them. As philosopher, he was very conscious of the tyrannical power words can have over thought, and he kept close rein on them in that sphere. But as literary artist he was ever sensitive to their suggestive appeal and allowed them to lead him on to the discovery and exploration of new aspects of things. "Words" he says, "are but the images of matter", needing the "life of reason and invention" to give them any validity. But he continues: ". . . yet, notwithstanding, it is a thing not hastily to be condemned, to clothe and adorn the obscurity, even of philosophy itself, with sensible and plausible elocution." And, in dealing with rhetoric, he observes



that "although in true value it is inferior to wisdom . . . yet with people it is the more mighty . . . it is eloquence that prevaieth in an active life."<sup>1</sup>

The office of rhetoric is "to apply reason to imagination for the better moving of the will." While the end of morality is to procure the affections to obey reason, the end of rhetoric is to fill the imagination to second reason. He quotes Plato with approval to the effect that "Virtue, if she could be seen, would move great love and affection", and points out that, as logic handles reason exact and in truth, so rhetoric handles it as it is planted in popular manners and opinions.

Bacon's dynamic mind generated an immense amount of thought, but he was never slipshod in the expressing of any of it. He was a connoisseur of language; every idea had its best embodiment in words, and this he always sought for. Arber tells us, "Great attention is to be paid to all his words, for their fulness of meaning adds much to the pleasure of the Essays."<sup>2</sup>

If another writer had already stated a piece of wisdom that pleased him, Bacon would not be averse to re-stating it, with a difference. "I have often observed," says Rawley, "and so have other men of great account, that if he had occasion to repeat another man's words after him, he had an use and faculty to dress them in better vestments and apparel than they had before: so that the author should find his own speech much amended and yet the substance of it still retained. As if it had been natural to him to use good forms . . ." Sometimes he would do this with the sentences of other authors to see if the change might yield a new idea, or to bring the earlier statement into illustrative support of some kindred thought of his own.

A favourite form of expression for Bacon was the *aphorism*—the terse and pithy formulation of a principle in art, morals or science. Again in the *Advancement* we find the reasons for his predilection: "Another diversity of method, whereof the consequence is great, is the delivery of knowledge in aphorisms, or in methods; wherein we may observe that it hath been too much taken into custom, out of a few axioms or observations upon any subject, to make a solemn and formal art, filling it with some discourses, and illustrating it with examples, and digesting it into a sensible method. But the writing in aphorisms hath many excellent virtues, whereto the writing in method does not approach. For first, it trieth the writer, whether he be superficial or solid: for aphorisms, except they should be ridiculous, cannot be made but of the pith and heart of sciences; for discourse of illustration is cut off; discourse of connexion and order is cut off; descriptions of practice are cut off. So there remaineth nothing to fill the aphorisms but some good quantity of observation: and therefore no man can suffice, nor in reason will attempt, to write aphorisms, but he that is sound and grounded . . . Secondly, methods are more fit to win consent or belief, but less fit to point to action; for they carry a kind of demon-

<sup>1</sup>*Advancement*, Book Two

<sup>2</sup>*A Harmony of Lord Bacon's Essays.*

stration in orb or circle, one part illuminating another, and therefore satisfy. But particulars being dispersed do best agree with dispersed directions. And lastly, aphorisms, representing a knowledge broken, do invite men to inquire further; whereas methods, carrying the show of a total, do secure men, as if they were at the furthest."

Another device for ensuring careful thinking and concise, accurate expression is the setting forth of the matter of debate in the form of *antitheta* and *formulae*. Bacon defines these as follows: "*Antitheta* are Theses argued *pro et contra*: wherein men may be more large and laborious: but (in such as are able to do it) to avoid prolixity of entry, I wish the seeds of the several arguments to be cast up into some brief and acute sentences; not to be cited, but to be as skeins or bottoms of thread, to be unwinded at large when they come to be used; supplying authorities and examples by reference . . . *Formulae* are but decent and apt passages or conveyances of speech, which may serve indifferently for differing subjects; as of preface, conclusion, digression, transition, excusation, etc. For as in buildings there is great pleasure and use in the well-casting of the stair-case, entries, doors, windows, and the like; so in speech, the conveyances and passages are of special ornament and effect."

In the volume, with the *Essays* and the *Meditationes Sacrae*, published in 1597 appeared another work, of an ethical and philosophical nature, called *Of the Colours of Good and Evil*. In form, this marks a stage intermediate between the *Promus* and the *Essays*. In the introduction Bacon says: "In deliberatives the point is; what is good and what is evil, and of good what is greater, and of evil, what is the less. So the persuader's labour is to make things appear good or evil, and that in higher or lower degree; which as it may be performed by true and solid reasons, so it may be represented also by colours, popularities, and circumstances, which are of such force, as they sway the ordinary judgement of a weak man, or of a wise man not fully and considerately attending and pondering the matter . . . Lastly, to make a true and safe judgement, nothing can be of greater use and defence to the mind, than the discovering and reprehension of these colours, shewing in what cases they hold, and in what they deceive: . . . which as it cannot be done, but of a very universal knowledge of the nature of things, so being performed it so cleareth man's judgement and election, as it is the less apt to slide into any error."

Only one of these "Colours" may be cited here for example:

*Quod rem integram servat bonum, quod sine receptu est malum. Nam se recipere non posse impotentiae genus est, potentia autem bonum.*

Hereof Aesope framed the Fable of the two Frogs that consulted together in time of drowth (when many plashes that they had repayed to were dry) what was to be done, and the one propounded to goe downe into a deepe Well, because it was like the water would not fayle there, but the other aunswered, yea but if it do faile how shall we get up againe? And the reason is, that humane actions are so uncertayne and subiect to perills, as that seemeth the best course which hath most passages out of it.

Appertaining to this perswasion the fourmes are, *you shall ingage*

*yourself.* On the other side, *Tantum quantum voles sumes ex fortuna,* you shall keepe the matter in your owne hands. The reprehension of it is, *That proceeding and resolving in all actions is necessarie:* for as he sayth well, *Not to resolve, is to resolve,* and many times it breedes as many necessities, and ingageth as farre in some other sort as to resolve.

So it is but the covetous mans disease translated into power, for the covetous man will enioy nothing because he will have his full store and possibilitie to enioy the more, so by this reason a man shoulde execute nothing because hee should be still indifferent and at libertie to execute any thing. Besides necessitie and this same *iacta est alea* hath many times an advantage, because it awaketh the powers of the minde, and strengtheneth indevor. *Ceteris pares necessitate certe superiores estis.*

It is not surprising to find Bacon himself using these different aids to the expressing of his thought, especially in the first small edition of the *Essays* in 1597. Much close and varied observation must go into the preparation of an aphorism; then comes the distilling of the thought into a complete but economic statement. The *Novum Organum*, whether it was intended by its author to be expanded into a full-dress discourse later, when more leisure might be available to him, was originally digested into aphorisms; and so it remains today. G. L. Craik has written: "The First Book of the *Novum Organum* is, not perhaps in respect of its pure Latinity, but yet in all such essential qualities of writing as do not depend upon the usages of a particular language, one of the most perfect of human compositions. Every sentence has evidently been elaborated with greatest care; and yet the easy unforced vigour and animation of the expression are as remarkable as its economy, compactness, and perspicuity. Nothing is redundant, and yet nothing is harsh or cramped: it would be difficult to mention any other writing in which aphoristic concentration and energy are so admirably blended with all the highest qualities of illustrative and frequently even decorative eloquence. No where else, probably, is there to be found either so crowded a succession of brilliant sentences, or yet a splendour more mild and grateful."<sup>1</sup>

It was indeed a study of Bacon's to be weighty without being wordy; to concern himself primarily with *what* he was saying, and not so much with *how* he was saying it. His chaplain gives evidence of Bacon's literary character: "In the composing of his books he did rather drive at a masculine and clear expression than at any fineness or affectation of phrases; and would often ask if the meaning were expressed plainly enough. As being one that accounted words to be subservient or ministerial to matter, and not the principal . . ." Yet it was never a case with him of 'more matter, less art'; the art followed naturally and easily, as the outcome of long devotion and the touch of genius. Words as such did concern him, and so many did he use that Dr. Johnson averred that a dictionary of the English language might be compiled from Bacon's works alone.

<sup>1</sup>Bacon: *His Writings and His Philosophy*, Vol. II.



His early ideals of compactness of structure, and the "fine-filed phrase", would account for Bacon's taking spontaneously to that form of essay-writing which is so distinctively his. From Montaigne, who had published his own *Essaies* in 1580, he borrowed the title for his 'certaine breif notes', and he explains what he means by the word in a draft dedication intended (but not printed) for an edition some time between 1607 and 1612: "The word is late, but the thing is ancient. For Seneca's Epistles to Lucilius, if one mark them well, are but *Essays*—that is, dispersed meditations, though conveyed in the form of epistles." More of Seneca's material, however, is from books than from experience; which fact differentiates him from Bacon. Although, in contrast to Seneca, there was more from experience than from books in Montaigne's writings, they were subjective in character, whilst Bacon's were objective. In his excellent edition of Bacon's Essays, S. H. Reynolds says: "The Latin title is explicit—*sermones fideles sive interiora rerum*—the insides of things, by way of contrast to the outside shows and pretences with which men had previously been put off. The writer poses as one who has authority to speak; as one who has been behind the scenes in the great theatre of the world, and who now comes forward to give others the result of his experience, to tell them the motives from which men commonly act, and the kind of conduct which may be expected from them, and to lay down rules and cautions which may help them to play their part safely and suitably in the perplexed game of life. It is not only that he has held a great place and has been occupied in great affairs. More impressive is the manner in which he has recorded his experience and the position which he thus asserts for himself. His language in his best passages has a singular majesty and force. His weighty sentences give what appears like the condensed thought of a life-time set down in most fit and telling words. They are uttered with an air of authority, and bear the stamp of a man who has a right to speak. It is the language of a superior being, who condescends to occupy his leisure moments with the concerns of a lower race, and to impart truths which his uninstructed readers could never have discovered for themselves."

Is there any development to be traced in the style of the Essays from their first publication in 1597 to the last edition of Bacon's own lifetime, that of 1625? "The composition, correction, and augmentation of these Essays stretched over a period of thirty years. They were commenced under Elizabeth, increased under James I, and assumed their final shape under Charles I. An author rarely maintains one style for so long a period, let him write much or little. The ordinary changes and vicissitudes of private life tell on us all, and our expression brightens or beclouds as our years wane. To this must be added the great toil, drive, and occupation of Bacon's public life: and the vast burden of the New Philosophy that constantly rested on his spirit. The marvel is that he ever found time to write the Essays at all . . . The first ten Essays are not true essays. They are severally a succession of the sharpest aphorisms, each isolated from the other . . . and otherwise independent. They are devoid of quotation, illustration, and almost of



explanation: and appear like a series of oracular sentences. When Bacon, after an interval of fifteen years, came to revise this First text, it was chiefly to expand, qualify, or illustrate it. The additions of absolute new thought are not numerous. But in the second and further revision of 1625, he almost doubled these earliest Essays in length. A striking change meets us as we come to his *second* Essay, *Of Friendship* . . . which is the first specimen herein of the final style of 1625. That Essay represents Bacon's last manner, and all the other Essays, in their successive alterations, do but more or less approximate to it. The Essay is now a methodical Discourse, generally under two or three heads. It usually begins with a quotation or an apophthegm. It teems with allusions and quotations, with anecdote and repartee: and altogether is a very brilliant piece of writing. Still, however, it is a succession of distinct points, rather than a ramble round one topic."<sup>1</sup>

This concise review of Bacon's progression as a stylist may best be illustrated by an examination of the essay *Of Friendship*, particularised by Arber, which, in its passage from the form as first published in 1612 to its final shape in 1625, is entirely rewritten. But as this Essay is a long one recourse is had here to the shorter, and therefore more convenient *Of Studies*. The passages which were newly added in 1625 are given in italic type, to distinguish the later version from that of 1597. Verbal changes are shown by giving the passages in sequence.

### *Of Studies*

- 1597 Studies serve for pastimes, for ornaments and for abilities. Their chiefe use for pastime is in privatenes and retiring; for ornamente is in discourse, and for abilitie is in judgement.
- 1625 Studies serve for Delight, for Ornament, and for Ability. Their Chiefe Use for Delight, is in Privatenesse and Retiring; For Ornament, is in Discourse; and for Ability, is in *the* Iudgement and Disposition of Businesse.
- 1597 For expert men can execute,
- 1625 For Expert Men can Execute, *and perhaps Iudge of particulars, one by one;*
- 1597 but learned men are fittest to iudge or censure.
- 1625 But the generall Counsels, and the Plots, and Marshalling of Affaires, come best from those that are Learned.
- 1597 To spend too much Time in Studies, (them, 1597) is Sloth
- and (slouth, 1597); To use them too much for Ornament, is Affecta-
- 1625 tion; To make Iudgement wholly by their Rules is the Humour of a Scholler.
- They perfect Nature, and are perfected by Experience:
- 1625 *For Naturall Abilities, are like Naturall Plants, that need Proynning by Study: And Studies themselves, doe give forth Directions too much at Large, except they be bounded in by experience.*

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Arber, *A Harmony of Lord Bacon's Essays*

- 1597 Crafty Men Contemne (contime, 1597) Studies (them, 1597);  
and Simple Men Admire them; and Wise Men Use them:
- 1625 For they teach not their owne Use; But that is a Wisdome without them, and above them, won by Observation. Reade not to Contradict, and Confute; Nor to Beleeve and Take for granted; Nor to Finde Talke and Discourse; But to weigh and Consider. Some Bookes are to be Tasted, Others to be Swallowed, and Some Few to be Chewed and Digested: That is, some Bookes are to be read onely in Parts; Others to be read but not Curiously (but cursorily, 1597); And some Few to be read wholly, and with Diligence and Attention.
- 1625 Some Bookes also may be read by Deputy, and Extracts made of them by Others: But that would be, onely in the lesse important Arguments, and the Meaner Sort of Bookes: else distilled Bookes, are like Common distilled Waters, Flashy things.
- 1597 Reading maketh a Full man; Conference a Ready Man; And  
and Writing an Exact Man. And therefore, If a Man Write little, he  
1625 had need have a Great memory; If he Conferre little, he had need have a Present Wit; and if he Reade little, he had need have much Cunning, to seeme to know that, he doth not. Histories make men Wise; Poets Witty; The Mathematicks Subtill; Naturall Philosophy deepe; Morall Grave; Logick and Rhetorick Able to Contend.
- 1625 *Abeunt studia in Mores. Nay there is no Stond or Impediment in the Wit, but may be wrought out by Fit Studies: Like as Diseases of the Body, may have Appropriate Exercises. Bowling is good for the Stone and Reines; Shooting for the Lungs and Breast; Gentle Walking for the Stomacke; Riding for the Head; And the like. So if a Mans Wit be Wandring, let him Study the Mathematicks; For in Demonstrations, if his Wit be called away never so little, he must begin again: If his Wit be not Apt to distinguish or find differences, let him Study the Schoolmen: For they are Cymini sectores.*
- If he be not Apt to beat over Matters, and to call up one Thing, to Prove and Illustrate another, let him Study the Lawyers Cases: So every Defect of the Minde, may have a Speciall Receipt.*

## THE SECRET SERVICE IN TUDOR TIMES

By R. L. EAGLE

THE well-established fact that Marlowe was an agent employed by Sir Francis Walsingham from 1587 while an undergraduate at Cambridge, and after he had taken his M.A. degree, until Walsingham's death in 1590, may serve to kindle interest in those who directed and those who served under them in the secret service. That Sir Thomas Walsingham, cousin of Sir Francis, carried on in an unofficial capacity after the latter's death, and was employing the same men including such as Ingram Frezer, Robert Poley, Marlowe and Nicholas Skeres (all present at the "liquidation" of Marlowe at Deptford at the end of May, 1593) is also well attested.

The Walsingham cousins had very close ties of affection and interests. One has only to study Thomas Watson's "Meliboeus," described on the title-page as "An Eglogue upon the Death of the Right Honorable Sir Francis Walsingham Late principall Secretarie to Her Majestie, and of her Honourable Privie Councill." It was printed in 1590 in Latin and English. The Latin version is dedicated to Sir Thomas Walsingham, and the English version to Lady Frances Sidney, the daughter of Sir Francis. In the "Eglogue," the Queen is "Diana"; Sir Francis is "Meliboeus", Sir Thomas speaks as "Tityrus", and Watson as "Corydon". Both Sir Francis and Sir Thomas are declared to be patrons of learning and literature.

In 1581, Sir Francis Walsingham was sent to Paris to negotiate a treaty with France which was calculated to destroy any agreement between France and Spain which would be dangerous to England. Watson's<sup>1</sup> "Eglogue" makes it clear that Sir Thomas accompanied his cousin, and that Watson was also there: *e.g.*:

*Tityrus (i.e., Sir Thomas)—<sup>1</sup>*

Thy tunes often pleas'd mine eare of yoare,  
When milk-white swans did flocke to heare thee sing,  
Where Seine in *Paris* makes a double shoare,  
*Paris* thrice blest if shee obey her King.

Why was the poet Watson in the company of the Walsingham cousins? Was he, like Marlowe, assisting in the secret service? Were there still more poets and dramatists using their intelligence as agents in return for patronage?

This appears to be highly probable for there is proof of yet another poet and playwright, Anthony Munday, being similarly engaged. One fact which has come to light is that in 1582, Munday had been hunting Catholics with success. We can learn that from his publication "A

---

<sup>1</sup> Note. I have referred to him as Sir Thomas Walsingham, even though he was not knighted until 1597.

Discoverie of Edmund Campion and his Confederates." There is no evidence known as to Munday's employer, but he went to Rome to spy on English Catholics, and to learn what he could to their detriment, and then betray them (see *Dictionary of National Biography*).

Literature was not a profession in those days. There was no living to be made from the writing of books or poems. There was no such thing as a "reading public" for those who could read were an extremely limited and favoured few. Even the writing of *plays* was miserably rewarded as we can see from Henslowe's diary. But the authors were intelligent and well-educated men, and what is more likely than for them to use their talents in employment for gathering political information? No doubt it was the Privy Council who employed Munday to carry out his successful detection of the Popish conspiracy in 1582, and who had previously sent him to Italy to spy on the English Catholics residing in the northern cities. On his return journey Munday had exhausted his funds while passing through France and had to make a diversion to Paris where he was given money by the British Ambassador to enable him to reach England. He would not have been so favoured had he not been on official business.

We do not know the names of all those who collected information for Walsingham from France, Italy, Spain and the Low Countries. Naturally, as secret service agents, they did not come into prominence, but from 1567 onwards Walsingham was supplying Burleigh with lists of names of those hostile to the Queen and the Government. In 1568, he put the secret service on an organised basis. The chief cipher expert was Thomas Phelippes, but another cipher expert employed by Walsingham was Anthony Standen, who worked for Essex after his patron's death. So clever was Standen that he was knighted and Walsingham procured for him from the Queen a pension of £100 yearly, i.e., at least £800 today. Standen's information for Essex was sent in letters to Anthony Bacon and he used numerals for letters. Some of these are preserved at Lambeth Palace and were printed in "Memoirs of The Reign of Queen Elizabeth" by Thomas Birch, D.D., in two volumes printed in 1754. I would particularly refer to Vol. I, p. 139, in the hope that somebody may be able to find the key to the cipher. All I can gather is that the Queen is 6589, Essex, is 71. Besides Robert Poley, Walsingham employed Gilbert Gifford (a Catholic traitor) and Thomas Harrison in the discovery of the Babington plot. There were probably others. Walsingham was kept well informed by his agents in Spain as to the preparations for the Armada and the invasion of England—even to the minutest details of men and armaments.

Anthony Bacon began his travels in 1579, and was sending intelligence to Burghley from Paris in 1580 as to the state of France. There was an agent named Edward Burnham assisting Anthony. He had contacts with Nicholas Faunt who was Walsingham's secretary, and advised him as to the state of affairs abroad. Anthony travelled into Northern Italy, afterwards residing in the South of France, principally Bordeaux, where he was favourably placed to pass instructions and receive information with regard to agents passing to and



from Spain. The news he received was passed as rapidly as possible to Essex.

Bacon's scrivenery at Twickenham was evidently used for the purpose of ciphering and deciphering political documents, as well as the copying of literary works and translations. Both Anthony and Francis were maintaining it. The house had been presented by Essex. In the correspondence of Francis and Anthony allusions to the kind of work carried on are fairly frequent. Thus Standen writes to Anthony in 1592:

"By Mr. Lawson I send you my travels of Turkey, Italy and Spain, as dear to me as you may imagine; yet nothing of too high a price for you. Having taken a copy, I desire the original might be delivered to my brother, which I entreat unto you; as also having taken what you best like out of the Zibaldone, if you commit them both to my brother's custody, he will have a care of them. For by my tossing to and fro in the manner I live, I might be deprived of such things, as at the time of my last trouble I left behind me in this town, and among others the discourse of the Spanish state which, when I may recover, you shall have."

I cannot trace anything about Standen's brother Edward, to whom he is referring, except that Standen, in the same letter, asks Anthony Bacon to introduce Edward to the lord treasurer. It appears, therefore that Edward Standen was also working for the secret service.

The "Zibaldone" is presumably a manuscript. Is anything known of it, and where is it, if it survives?

In 1594-5, Francis wrote to Anthony Bacon from Twickenham on 25th January:

"I have here an idle pen or two specially one that was cozened, thinking to have got some money this term. I pray you send me somewhat else for them to write out beside your Irish collection, which is almost done. There is a collection of Dr. James (Dean of Christchurch) of foreign states largeliest in Flanders which, though it be no great matter, yet I would be glad to have it."

In 1596, Essex sent by his secretary, Henry Cuffe, "a true relation of the action at Cadiz", Cuffe writing to Anthony:

"The original you are to keep because my Lord charged me to turn either the whole or the sum of it into French, and to cause it to be sent to some good personage in these parts under a false name or anonymously."

The reason for this secrecy was that the Queen had disapproved of Essex going on this expedition, and was further disgruntled on his return. Although he was victorious over the Spanish fleet, there was no loot to compensate for the expense. Cuffe had drawn up an account of the expedition, but was commanded by the Queen, on pain of death, not to set forth any discourse of this service without her permission. Anthony Bacon tried through influential channels to get such permission and not meeting with success resolved to get copies sent abroad

secretly, Copies were, indeed, made and were sent to the Courts of Scotland, France and the Low Countries.

The question has often been asked as to what Francis Bacon was doing in the first forty years of his life. Apart from concealed literary work especially in the composition of plays, there can be no doubt but that he was engaged in assisting Essex and his brother Anthony in the examining and deciphering of secret service reports. I wish we knew more about the purpose of a letter sent by Standen to Anthony Bacon in which he informed him that, according to his order, he had immediately upon his arrival there (i.e., the Earl of Essex's house) "moved Mr. Francis Bacon for the cypher, who answered, that within a few days might be offered some occasion by hearing from Dr. Morrison; "for which reason he thought it not so well to send it till then; but that he would the next day write his mind to his brother."

This letter is at Lambeth among the papers of Anthony Bacon in Vol. IV, folio 16. There is much to be discovered at Lambeth for anybody who has the time, and who is used to reading the handwriting of that period.

It is an interesting fact that those who employed their own agents—Burleigh, Walsingham, Essex, all died bankrupt. They provided the expense over and above that allowed by the parsimonious Queen.

EDITOR'S NOTE:—Mr. Eagle is an authority on Elizabethan literature, and all Baconians should be familiar with his books, details of which are advertised elsewhere in this issue.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor, LIVE LETTERS, *Daily Mirror*.

Dear Sir,

### THE SHAKESPEARE AUTHORSHIP

Delia Bacon "decided that the philosopher, Roger Bacon was really the author" of the Shakespeare plays. You cannot have read her book. She came to the conclusion that Francis Bacon was the chief pen of a group of writers. Roger Bacon lived three hundred years earlier!

As for the "don't care who wrote the plays so long as we have them" attitude, surely the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is worth while. The discoveries of such as Galileo and Copernicus (abused and persecuted in their lifetimes for their opinions which upset previous erroneous teaching) did not materially alter the lives of the people. I wonder if it was said what does it matter whether the earth goes round the sun or the sun goes round the earth, so long as we get the sunshine.

Yours truly,

BRUNO.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

In answer to a request in connection with the "nine Tudors on end" which I mentioned in my article *Secret of State*<sup>1</sup> I must say that I have solemnly promised not to reveal their location until certain circumstances arise; but one may still get sufficient information about the invaluable seal system used by Bacon. Photographs of such seals, deciphered (or, I had better say, revealed) appeared in a book in the preparation of which I was happy to play a minor part.

These seals are designed to give *proof of authentication*, a proof which is not spectacular but of *unparalleled proving value*, which is what educated people should ask from a proof. It is based on a scientific principle similar to fingerprinting (hence the term *revealed*), but it is even superior to the Bertillon system. This system, once the prints are revealed, still requires reference cards which may be:

- (a) unobtainable
- (b) lost
- (c) deliberately suppressed
- (d) misnamed or faked.

The Baconian system has none of these disadvantages though, exactly like identification by finger prints, it is based on the experimental method and on "probabilism". That means, of course, that even now, after three centuries and more, the public mind is not educated enough to understand without explanations the deadly "proof value" of those personal marks.

You will see more than a *hundred examples* of these seals in the photographs of the book referred to: "DEFENSE DE WILL", by F. Bonac-Melvrau (in reality a team of amateur detectives, the leader of whom, unfortunately, is dead now). The book is published by *Librairie d'Art Ancien et Moderne*, 4 rue des Beaux-Arts, Paris-6. As the book was not written by Calvin Hoffmann, it has not been publicized the world over through press agencies. Although published *before* C. Hoffmann's work, it records that *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, on which our American bases his theory, was partly written by Marlowe: *I Tudor and Marlow too*, says the seal (page 104, and photograph 92).

*Defense de Will* is written in French and requires at least two attentive, but profitable, readings, for the physico-mathematical principle of Bacon's "finger-prints", though quite simple and not beyond the reach of the non-specialized educated man, is still so far in advance of our times that it is not yet "in the grain". Such knowledge is still "cortical", that is to say the modern man has

<sup>1</sup> December, 1955 BACONIANA, page 106.



it in the more recent outside part of his brain, the cortex; it has not yet seeped into the ancestral central part. While one's sense of right and left, or even the multiplication table easily become part and parcel of our nature, our knowledge of aerodynamics, for instance, *though extensive and sound* as the aeroplanes prove, is still exterior to us. It is not yet in our flesh and blood. Such is our knowledge of probabilism. But nobody doubts the value of fingerprints, though we do not "realize" fully their probabilities principle. So the Bacon team were clever indeed and much in advance of their times when they devised the carefully hidden but self-proving seals, much better hidden than a filigree in a bank-note and much more efficient. No wonder that they were imagined, or at least used, by an eminent jurist who had so profoundly meditated on the vexing "What is Truth?" problem.

Fortunately, some of the seals shown in *Defense de Will*, have their more spectacular, if not technically so brilliant, sides. Some of them are set in such a way that they become sometimes highly jocular and sometimes acrobatic: designs corresponding to the outward text (*Behold King B., a King is on a stage and you have "Tudor-Bacon-Shakespear"*); designs pointing to the spearhead in pictures of Pallas (photographs 43 and 49, with a hog among Tudor roses or a motto "*Dubio genitore creatus*", anagram of "*Tudori gentis vere Baco*", "issued from an uncertain father" becoming "Bacon really of the Tudor family"); designs pointing crudely to Elizabeth and Leicester, so crudely they could not be completely revealed on the photographs, etc., etc.

The proof supplied by the seals in themselves is experimental—the only valuable sort of proof. When certain outward signs, purely conventional, agree in a given *copy* of a Renaissance book, seals are always found, after some work. To the lay mind, they could seem to be pure chance. But after *centuries* of delving, you could not find such a seal in the columns of a modern newspaper or in a modern title-page—where it would be due to pure chance. The principle of authentication by fingerprints is the same: pure unaided chance cannot *practically* realize a fingerprint similar to a given one; therefore two similar fingerprints must come from the same finger.

Of course, extensive experiments have been conducted to see if chance could succeed in leaving such a seal. But for these experiments *a different wording* of the seal has been chosen *a priori*. For it happens that some secret brotherhoods, until *very* recently at least, and at "top level" only, have used the same seals to show their affiliation to Shakespear and "Bacon-Tudor". By producing some modern instances of the seals they could pretend they are due to chance "since they can be found in modern texts"! But this trick is impossible if the criterion chosen to prove the validity of the seals follows the same patterns and the same rules but is differently worded. They could look for ages before they could find a seal worded "frenchbean-salad-purse", agreed upon beforehand, in a Renaissance original edition!

The upshot of it all is that any Court of Law that would refuse the Baconian seals as absolute proof of identification would condemn itself to repudiating fingerprints, as pure fantasy!

But it is a long, long way from proof to public recognition. Yet, whatever the delaying tactics and rearguard actions of the inspired Press, the way is shorter every day, every hour.

Yours sincerely,  
P. HENRIOT.

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Dear Sir,

In the *Maçonnisk Weekblad* (a weekly) of 1919 Dr. H. A. W. Speckman mentions in an article, "The Brethren of the Rosicrucians", a secret writing on the monument of Shakespeare in Westminster Abbey.

As this is the first time I have heard of this inscription, I would like to ask any reader if it is still on that monument, as given below:

FAMA.  
FR. BACO. CL.  
W.S. VVV.



The letters C.L. contain Bacon's name in cypher. C. is 3, L. is 11,  $3 \times 11$  is 33. The letters V.V.V. mean  $3 \times 20$  or  $20.3 = 203 = 100 + 103 =$  Francis Bacon & Shakespeare. In common with other secret indications, as for instance, the misquoted lines of *The Tempest*, this indication is apparently not visible to the general public.

Yours truly,  
COUNT L. L. DE RANDWYCK.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

### JUPITER SITTING UPON AN EAGLE

The following extract from A. L. Rowse's "The Expansion of Elizabethan England" may be of interest. In a description of some of the English ships at the time of the Armada, this passage occurs on page 255:

"When the White Bear" was re-built she bore a carved image of Jupiter sitting upon an eagle with the clouds before the head of the ship . . . . ."

Could Francis Bacon have had this striking image in mind when "Cymbeline" was being written?

Yours etc.,  
ELLA HORSEY.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

I have read from time to time, and have heard from the lips of those interested in the Baconian theory, the likely whereabouts of the "Shakespeare" manuscripts.

The purpose of this letter is to ask all those who have any theories about the present location of the manuscripts to be so kind as to write to me on the subject.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) SIDNEY R. CAMPION

22 Erridge Road, Merton Park, Wimbledon, S.W. 19.